



TO THE WORKING PEOPLE, ON THE NEW DEAD-BODY BILL.

Stockport, in Cheshire, 24th Jan. 1832.

MY FRIENDS,

THE above subject is very interesting to you, and I beg you to give it your particular attention. You have been informed of the horrible murders in London, committed by the bloody BISHOP and others; and I will now explain to you *the cause* of those murders. When you clearly see this cause, you will know how *you* ought to think and *feel* upon the subject.

There are in London and some other great towns, places where men are *engaged in cutting up dead human bodies*. What they do this *for*; that is to say, under what *pretence* they do this, I will speak by-and-by; at present I have only to speak of the fact, and to show you that it is *the cause* of the *horrible murders*, that you have lately read of. The cutters-up of human bodies, or *body-cutters* purchase dead bodies to cut up, and with just as little scruple and ceremony as *cutting-butchers* purchase the dead bodies of pigs or sheep from the *carcass-butchers*. The law, as it now stands, makes it only a *misdemeanor*, that is to say, a crime punishable by *fine* and *imprisonment*, as a *common assault* is, or as a *libel* is, to *steal*, to *sell*, or to *purchase*, a dead human body; and I pray you mark, that to steal the dead body of a *sheep*, or *pig*, or *calf*, or *ox*, or *fowl* of any sort, is a *capital felony*, punished with *DEATH*; and that to

receive any such body, or to have it in *your possession*, *knowing it to be stolen*, is also a felony, punished with *TRANSPORTATION*. This law extends to all sorts of moveable property; and a bookseller named CAHUACK (or some such name) *was transported*, some few years ago, for *purchasing* and having in his possession some *copies of a book* which had been stolen out of the warehouse of Mr. BENSLEY, in Bolt-court. This bookseller had a family, carried on a respectable business, and bore a fair character; and he alleged that *he did not know* the books to have been stolen. From the circumstances, however, the jury were satisfied that *he did know* them to have been stolen; and he was transported; and very justly transported; for he was as criminal as the thief himself.

But, my friends, if it be *just* (and it is so) to punish with transportation a man who receives the dead body of a *pig*, knowing it to be stolen, *what are we to say* to the law which punishes *so slightly*, and, in practice, *punishes not at all*, he who receives and cuts up the dead body of one of the people, though he *MUST KNOW* that it has been *stolen*, if not *murdered*? What are we to say of *such a law*? And while the law stands thus, what is the *protection* that the labouring people receive from the law?

On the 12th of December last, the following letter was published in all the London newspapers. I beg you to read it with attention.

"SIR,—Having dined yesterday with "some of my brother magistrates, I "learned, upon information which I "have no reason to distrust, that beside "the confessions published, another "was made on Sunday last, which com- "prehended a *catalogue of about sixty* "murders, and would have probably "gone on to a much greater extent, but "for the interference of the ordinary. "When to this is added the large supply "which by the published confessions,

“ Bishop appears to have furnished for
 “ dissection, the great number of persons
 “ employed in the same way, the pro-
 “ bable profligacy of such persons, and,
 “ as asserted, *a great falling off in the*
 “ *number of burials*, notwithstanding
 “ the increased population of this me-
 “ tropolis, there is certainly but too
 “ much reason to believe that this
 “ *system of murder amongst the poor*,
 “ which Bishop said he resorted to as
 “ both *less expensive and less hazardous*
 “ than collecting from cemeteries, is
 “ become *extremely common*, that it is
 “ in a *state of progression*, and that
 “ *new and extraordinary modes*, how-
 “ ever inconvenient to the professors and
 “ *students of anatomy*, MUST BE HAD
 “ RECOURSE TO, FOR THE PRE-
 “ VENTION OF SUCH ATROCIOUS
 “ CRIMES. “ J. SEWELL.

“ 21, Cumberland-street,
 “ Portman-square, Dec. 8.”

This Mr. SEWELL is a *police magis-
 trate*, and, besides this, his statement is
notoriously true. Thus, then, *sixty poor*
persons, at the very least, have been
murdered in London alone. Probably
hundreds; but *sixty at the least*. And, ob-
 serve, they have all been RECEIVED
by the cutters-up; and no detection of
 the murderers ever took place, until that
 of the bloody Bishop and his associates,
 whose conduct was so open and unwary,
 that the *receivers* saw that they were
 liable to be *implicated themselves in the*
crime of murder. The apology, the
 impudent, the audacious excuse of the
 cutters-up, is, that “ they cannot always
 “ distinguish the body of a person who
 “ has been *murdered* from that of one
 “ who has *died a natural death*.” This
 is stated by the council of the *Royal*
College of Surgeons, in their letter to
 Lord Melbourne of the 10th of Decem-
 ber last; a document the most impu-
 dent and unfeeling (see it, *Register*,
 Jan. 14.) that ever was put upon paper.
 Well, then, since they declare, that
 even they are unable to distinguish a
 murdered body from one that has died
 a natural death; and, since it is noto-
 rious that there are hundreds (ay,
hundreds!) of cutters-up of human bod-
 ies; and that there are many places

for the *receiving and purchasing* of hu-
 man bodies, and that, too, *in open de-
 fiance of the present law*; what ought
 the Parliament to have done the moment
 it met, after the detection of the recent
 horrible murders? Why, pass a law,
 to be sure, making the *stealing* and
 the *receiving* of the dead body of a
 human being a crime *as great*, at the
 least, as the stealing and the receiving of
 the dead body of a pig or a sheep. This
 is what the Parliament ought to have
 done at the least. And, indeed, it ought
 to have done much more. The College
 of Surgeons allow, that even *they* are
 not, in all cases, able to distinguish be-
 tween *murdered* bodies and bodies *stolen*
from the coffin. The cutter-up and the
 receiver *never know* that they are
not accessories to the commission of
 murder: they proceed in their bloody
 work, knowing that they may be such
 accessories. No man, nothing short of
 a monster, will deny that it is *as great a*
 crime to steal the dead body of a human
 being as it is to steal the dead body of a
 sheep or a pig. Therefore, that crime
 ought to be punished *with death* as is
 the crime of stealing the dead body of a
 pig or sheep; and *death* ought also to
 be the punishment of the *receiver* and
 the *cutter-up*; because they can, ac-
 cording to their own confession, never
 know that they are not wilfully and
 premeditatedly engaged in an act which
 makes them accessories to the commis-
 sion of murder, both before and after
 the fact. In short, an act ought to have
 been passed, the moment the Parliament
 met, to punish *as murderers*, all those
 who should, in future, be found to have
in their possession any human body, or
 part of any human body, not delivered
 up to them *in consequence of a sentence*
in a court of justice.

This is what the Parliament *ought to*
have done. And what *have they done*?
 Why, one WARBURTON has brought in
 a bill, which is now before the House
 of Commons. I have not seen this
 bill; but the following has been pub-
 lished *as an abstract of it*; and this
 abstract is *quite enough for me*. I
 will first insert it, and then remark
 upon it.

SCHOOLS OF ANATOMY.

The preamble of this bill states, that whereas a knowledge of the causes and nature of very many diseases which affect the body, and of the best methods of treating and curing such diseases, and of healing and repairing divers wounds and injuries, to which the human frame is liable, *cannot be acquired but by anatomical examination*; and whereas, therefore, it is *highly expedient to give protection*, under certain regulations, to the study and practice of anatomy:—

Clause I. therefore enacts the Secretary of State to appoint Inspectors of Schools of Anatomy.

II. Name of Inspector, and District to which he belongs, to be published in the *London Gazette*.

III. One Inspector to reside in London, and one other in Edinburgh.

IV. Inspectors to receive returns and certificates.

V. To visit any place where anatomy is carried on.

VI. *Salaries to Inspectors.*

VII. Executors may permit bodies to undergo anatomical examination in certain cases.

VIII. The same not to be removed from the place where such person may have died, without a certificate.

IX. Professors, surgeons, and others, may receive bodies for anatomical examination.

X. Such person to receive with the body a certificate, as aforesaid.

XI. Persons described in this Act *not to be liable to punishment for having in their possession human bodies, nor for any offence against this Act, unless the prosecution is instituted by the Attorney-General.*

XII. This Act not to prohibit *post-mortem* examination.

XIII. So much of 9 Geo. IV., c 31, as directs that the bodies of murderers may be dissected is *repealed*.

XIV. Bodies of murderers to be *buried in the highway, or hung in chains.*

XV. This Act not to extend to Ireland.—
[*And why not?*]

Pray look well at clauses 9 and 11; especially at clause 11; and observe, that nobody is to prosecute but the *Attorney-General*! Pray mark that. **THIS SAME WARBURTON** brought in a bill, in 1829, to authorise *masters of workhouses, overseers of the poor, keepers of hospitals, and keepers of prisons, to dispose of* (and, of course, to *sell*) the bodies of all persons dying under their keeping, or power, unless such bodies were *claimed by relations*; and, even then, such relations were *not to have the bodies, unless they could*

give security for the burial of them according to the rites of the church. Thus were the very *poorest of the poor* to have their bodies sold to be cut up! Thus were the Parliament to fulfil the command of God, and to show their belief in his word. “Despise not the poor because he is poor,” says the Bible. What would this law have said? Why, “*cut him up because he is poor?*”

This bill *passed the House of Commons*; and was carried to THE LORDS, who, to their great honour, *rejected it*. When it went to the Lords, I petitioned against it. I gave my petition to the *Bishop of London*, who presented it on the 26th May, 1829. Now, my friends, read this petition *attentively*. It states your case. It puts forward *your claim to protection* against the cutters-up and the grave-robbers and the murderers.

To the Right Honourable the Lords Spiritual and Temporal of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland in Parliament assembled.

The petition of William Cobbett, of Kensington,

Most humbly sheweth,

That a bill has just passed the Commons' House of Parliament, which bill gives authority to overseers, or other persons who have the charge of poor-houses and hospitals, to dispose of (and, of course, to *sell*) the dead bodies of those paupers and patients who may die in workhouses and hospitals, and whose bodies are not claimed by their relations, those relations giving security that they will, at their own charge, cause the said bodies to be buried.

That your humble petitioner is quite sure that your Right Honourable House will clearly perceive that such a law is just the same thing as a law to authorise overseers and hospital-keepers to dispose of the dead bodies of *all poor persons whatsoever*, dying under their charge; for that the bare fact of the death taking place under such circumstances, is quite enough to convince every one, that the bodies of such poor persons will, on account of the poverty of their relations, never be claimed, especially if the claim be to compel the claimant to give security for defraying the expense of an interment; and that, therefore, this is, in short, a bill to enable the agents of the rich to dispose of the dead bodies of the most unfortunate of the poor, and that, too, for the benefit of those rich.

That your humble petitioner begs to be permitted to state to your Right Honourable House, that those poor and necessitous persons, whom the law calls paupers, have a clear



and undoubted *right to be relieved* out of the property of the owners and occupiers of the houses and the lands; that this law is, as stated by Blackstone, founded in the principles of civil society; that it has been confirmed by the canon law, by the writings of the Christian fathers, by the law of nations as laid down by civilians, by the common law of England, and, lastly, by the statute law of England; and that this right extends to interment after death, according to the rights and ceremonies of the established church.

That the unfortunate persons who die in poor-houses and hospitals have, in numerous cases, seen better days, and have, during many years, contributed by direct payments towards the maintenance of the poor and the sick; that those of them who have not thus contributed, have all been, as long as able to work, compelled to pay heavy taxes out of the fruits of their hard labour; that every working man, of whatever description, pays full the one-half of his wages in taxes; and that, therefore, when he becomes so poor, helpless, and destitute, as to die in a poor-house or in a hospital, it is unjust, cruel, barbarous to the last degree, to dispose of his dead body to be cut up like that of a murderer, and to let him know beforehand, too, that his body is thus to be treated, thereby adding to the pangs of death itself.

That your humble petitioner beseeches your Right Honourable House to bear in mind, that, in 1804, a Return, laid before Parliament, stated that upwards of two thousand persons, men, women, and children, belonging to noble or rich families, were receiving annually large sums of money out of the taxes in the shape of pensions and sinecures, and that none of these persons had ever rendered any service to the public for the sums thus by them received; that your petitioner does not think it probable that a less sum is on this account now paid out of the taxes than was paid in 1804; that, in like manner, large sums of money, amounting in the whole to more than a million and a half of pounds sterling, have, within these few years, been given by the Parliament for "*the relief of the poor clergy of the church of England*"; that those who are now paupers have, during their whole lives, *been paying taxes to support these poor nobles and clergy*; that they have, in fact, for the far greater part, been reduced to a state of pauperism by the taxes, and by the taxes alone; and that those bodies which have been worn out or debilitated by labours performed and privations endured for the benefit of the rich, are now, when breathless, to be sold and cut up for the benefit of those same rich.

That all nations, even the most barbarous, have shown respect for the remains of the dead; that the Holy Scriptures invariably speak of the rites of burial as being honourable, and of the refusal of those rites as an infamous punishment and signal disgrace; that in the 15th chap. of Genesis, 15th verse,

it is recorded, that amongst the gracious promises that God made to ABRAHAM, on account of his faith, one was that he should be *buried* in a good old age; that DAVID (2 Samuel chap. 2.), when the men of Jabesh-gilead had *buried* Saul, blessed them for his kindness, and said the Lord would reward them; that the Psalmist, in describing the desolation of Jerusalem by the hands of the heathen, says that these latter had given the dead bodies of the Israelites to be meat unto the fowls of the heavens, that they shed their blood like water, and that there was *none to bury them*, which, he adds, has made the Israelites a reproach to the other nations; that in ECCLESIASTES, chap. 6, verse 3, it is said, that if a man have ever so prosperous and long a life, if he have *no burial* he had better never have been born; that we find by EZEKIEL, chap. 39, that even enemies were to be *buried*, and that if a human bone was found above ground, it was to be deemed a duty to inter it; that the prophet ISAIAH, chap. 14, says that the King of Babylon shall be kept out of the grave, like an abominable branch, and shall *not be buried*, because he has been a tyrant; that the prophet Jeremiah, chap. 7 and 8, at the conclusion of a long and terrible denunciation against the Jews, tells them that they *shall not be gathered nor be buried*, and that they shall be as dung upon the face of the earth; that the same prophet chap. 14, says, that the people who listen to false prophets shall die of famine and the sword, and *shall have none to bury them*; that the same prophet, chap. 16, foretelling the ruin of the Jews, says that they shall die of grievous deaths, that they shall not be lamented, *neither shall they be buried*, but shall be as dung upon the face of the earth; that the same prophet, chap. 22, pronounces judgment on JEHOIAKIM, King of Juda, for covetousness, for shedding innocent blood, for oppression and violence, that he *shall be buried with the burial of an ass*, drawn and cast forth before the gates of Jerusalem; that in the New Testament, we find that *devout men carried STEPHEN to his burial*; and, finally, that by our own burial service and canons we are taught, that to be buried in consecrated ground is a *right* belonging to every person who has been baptized, who is not, at the hour of death, excommunicated, and who has not killed him or herself.

That seeing that such is the language of Holy Writ, your humble petitioner has waited until now, hoping that the bill in question would be zealously and effectually opposed by the clergy of the Established Church; that, if the bodies of poor persons can be disposed of and cut up into pieces, without any detriment to our faith, our hope, our religious feeling; if no burial service is at all necessary in these cases, if this be told to the people by this bill, it is manifest, that that same people will not long think that the burial service can in any case be necessary, and that they will, in a short time, look upon all other parts of the

church
as y
grou
ness
in th
Buri
may
the S

Th
suad
in a
canu
try w
to be
purpo
the p
fore,
the c
sequ
come

Th
your
that
hatr
impl
wou
dura
idea
quin
eloc
the
by
san
lar
the
of
ric

tio
Ho
bu
op
an
an

d
r
s
c
r
c

church service as equally useless; because, as your petitioner presumes, there is no ground whatever for believing in the sacredness of one rite or ceremony any more than in that of another, and that, of course, if the Burial of the Dead can be dispensed with, so may Baptism, Confirmation, Marriage, and the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper.

That your humble petitioner is firmly persuaded, that a belief in the resurrection, and in a future state of rewards and punishments, cannot exist for any length of time in a country where human bodies are by law permitted to be disposed of, and that, too, for the avowed purpose of being cut to pieces for the use of the parties acquiring them; and that, therefore, atheism, generally prevalent throughout the country, must be one of the natural consequences of this bill, if, unhappily, it become a law.

That your humble petitioner hopes that your Right Honourable House will perceive, that if this bill were to become a law, the hatred of the rich by the poor must become implacable and universal, while the latter would be taught by this bill atheism, and obduracy of heart, and familiarity with ferocious ideas and bloody deeds; and that it would require greater powers of persuasion than even eloquent men generally possess to convince the poor that they ought to be restrained by anything but want of power, while the same Government which takes from them a large part of their earnings for the support of the rich, condemns their bodies to be disposed of after death, for the benefit of those same rich.

That, for these reasons, your humble petitioner prays, that your Right Honourable House will not pass the bill aforementioned, but will protect the poor against a species of oppression more odious as well as more cruel and more hostile to feelings of humanity than any ever before heard of in the world.

And your petitioner will ever pray.

WM. COBBETT.

London, 22d May, 1829.

Now, my friends, the present bill differs from the former one, in some respects; but its main tendency is the same. What it will be at last, we cannot as yet precisely say; but, in the meanwhile, look at the following report of a debate, which took place in the House of Commons on the 17th instant.

Mr. WARBURTON moved the second reading of the bill for providing subjects for the anatomical schools. The honourable member, who spoke in a low tone, was understood to say, that as the bill had been twice before the House, which has assented to its principles on former occasions, he thought any explanation unnecessary.

Sir ROBERT INGLIS did not think it sufficient that this bill had been twice before the

House formerly, to induce the House to pass it. He required further explanation. He was glad to observe that in the present bill there was a distinct enactment separating the dissection from the crime of murder; he was satisfied that the study of anatomy was necessary for the successful practice of medicine, and that, therefore, some means must be taken to remedy the present state of the law. He had ascertained that during last year there were *only eleven bodies* which could be legally disposed of as subjects, and these were to *supply eight hundred students of medicine*. While the principles of the bill were deserving the attention of the House, so were its details. There was one of these to which he objected. *He thought the relations of persons dying in jails, workhouses, &c., should have their bodies if they chose to demand them.* He would not oppose the second reading of the bill.

Mr. CRESSET PELHAM opposed the bill, and contended that it *merely gave a legal encouragement to the traffic in human blood.*

Mr. HUME supported the bill, and expressed his surprise that the honourable Baronet, the member for Oxford (Sir R. Inglis), should not perceive that the bill would *make subjects cheap*, and that its provisions were therefore the more likely to put an end to the traffic of those who *calculated on a high price* as a reward for the perpetration of crime.

Mr. PERCEVAL recommended that *the mere possession of dead bodies should be held to be a felony*. The knowledge of surgery could not be lost in the short space of two years, and if they were to try an experiment for that time, he was sure that medical men would then resort to the dissection of animals, and obtain from it when conducted under proper regulations, all the knowledge necessary for their profession.

Mr. F. POLLOCK defended the principle of the bill, and expressed his surprise to see it maintained as just that medical men were to be civilly, aye, and criminally punished for ignorance of their profession, and yet punished at the same time for *any attempt to acquire knowledge*. He was convinced that the bill would effect a most beneficial change, without in the slightest degree *wounding that sensitive feeling among the lower classes*, which he should be one of the last to wish wholly obliterated.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL was in favour of the bill. It made no alteration in the punishment of those who were guilty of crime. Burking was still murder, and punishable with all the severity it deserved; but the bill took away one of the incitements to the crime, by *diminishing the expense and the risk of procuring subjects*.

Mr. WARBURTON briefly replied. The bill was intended to do *equal justice to the poor and the rich*, and it excepted only two cases from its operation. The first was when a person specially requested *that his body might not be dissected*, and the second was, when the *next of kin* was decidedly averse to the performance

of the operation. Nothing could be more idle than to exclaim that *the rich were solely benefited* by the diffusion of the knowledge of anatomy. *The very contrary was the fact.* The rich employ those who had obtained, at a great cost, their knowledge of their profession abroad, while the poor were compelled to accept that kind of assistance which was within their reach, and which, if it did not include practical information on the structure of the human frame, would soon be lamentably inefficient.

From this we are to conclude, that the *bodies of the poor*, who die in *prisons, hospitals, and poor-houses*, are to be disposed of to the cutters-up. No matter on *what condition*: I care not a straw about that: here will be a law to give up the dead bodies of the poor to the hackers and cutters; and that is quite enough for me. I agree with Mr. PELHAM and Mr. PERCEVAL; and I abhor the expressions of HUME and of DENMAN about making dead bodies CHEAP! POLLOCK will find, I fancy, that it will "wound the sensitive feelings of the poor." He has not read that part of my first LECTURE at Manchester, which related to this matter. It is curious that the WHIG REFORMERS are for *this bill*, and that the TORIES are against it! What sort of a reform the Whigs have in view we may guess from this circumstance. For my part, I am very hard to believe that those who are for this bill mean the people any good by the Reform Bill. I repeat here my words at Manchester; namely, that if a reformed Parliament cannot find the means of protecting the *dead bodies* of the working people, while such ample means are found for protecting the dead body of a hare, a pheasant, or a partridge; then, indeed the bishops did right in opposing the Reform Bill; for a greater delusion, a greater fraud, never was attempted to be practised on any part of mankind. Let me stop here to request your particular attention to this matter relating to the want of law to protect the dead bodies of the working people. You all know, or at least every Englishman ought to know, that for an unqualified person to have in *his possession* the body of a hare, pheasant, or partridge, was, a few months back, a crime, punishable by fine or imprisonment;

that to have in his possession *wires*, or other implements, for taking any of these wild animals, is still a crime, punishable in the same manner; that, to be out in the night in *pursuit of*, and seeking after, the bodies of either of these wild animals, and carrying with him the implements wherewith to take or kill them, is still a crime, punishable with *transportation for seven years*, and this punishment may be inflicted, too, and has been, and is, frequently inflicted without the sanction of a judge, and at the sole discretion and pleasure of the justices in quarter-sessions, who, as you well know, are the game-preservers themselves. Yet those who could, and so recently too, pass over this last-mentioned law, and those new and "liberal" members who have been able to sit quietly, and say not a word about this law for transporting men for making free with the bodies of wild animals, which, according to Blackstone, are the property of no man, and which belong in common to all men; those who could make and so vigilantly enforce this law, cannot, for the lives and souls of them, find out the means of passing a law to protect the bodies, *alive or dead*, of the working people; other than that of making it lawful to *sell their bodies when dead*, to cut up and cast away like the bodies of murderers or traitors. From everything that I have ever heard here in the North, and particularly in this town, I believe, that if the horrible bill to which I have just alluded had become a law, that law would have never been acted upon by the parochial authorities of Manchester. I hope that the same would generally have been the case; but I have no scruple to say, that an attempt to enforce the law in any of the agricultural counties would have produced open and desperate rebellion. Judge you of the feelings of the country people on this subject, when I tell you that there are *clubs* in the country parishes in Sussex, Kent, Surrey, Hampshire, and, I suppose, in all the southern counties, which clubs are for the purpose of forming a fund for defraying the expenses of *watching the graves of the relations of the members of the club*, if

any of the m
die!
of the
gracefu
Judge
conseq
among
for sel
those o
A lab
worke
ago, c
to get
pay (t
the gr
then a
govern
discov
him w
Great
the ric
eager
law h
has m
feloni
portat
have
not b
whate
OF S
MUS
have
as sto
tural
nisha
his pe
dead
that
sente
If
this
think
in h
"fre
this
econ
their
short
resul
for b
oppo
with
hish
live

any of them should die, or the graves of the members themselves if they should die! How honourable to the feelings of the working people, and how disgraceful to the Parliament, is this fact! Judge you what would have been the consequences of an attempt to enforce amongst such a people the atrocious bill for selling their bodies to be cut up like those of the most heinous malefactors! A labouring man, JAMES IVES, who worked constantly for me some time ago, came to me, with tears in his eyes, to get 12s. in advance of his wages, to pay (that being the price) for *watching the grave of his daughter*, who was just then about to be buried! Why what *government-protection* could this man discover? What had this man to make him willing to be obedient to the laws? Great care is taken of the *property of the rich*; the law hunts it with inflexible eagerness go whither it may; here the law has grown harder and harder, till it has made the receiving of stolen goods a *felonious* offence, punishable with *transportation*. But those who passed and have enforced so rigidly this law, have not been able to find out by any means whatever to punish the RECEIVERS OF STOLEN BODIES; though they MUST of necessity KNOW them to have been stolen, if not murdered as well as stolen! Common justice, even natural justice, would make it *felony*, punishable with death, in any one to have in his *possession* a dead body, or a part of a dead body, unless able to produce proof that he obtained it in consequence of a *sentence of a court of justice*.

If reform be to bring us laws like this; if it be to give us rulers, who think it a good thing to make the *trade in human bodies free*; if this be the "*free trade*" they mean to give us; if this be a specimen of their *political economy*; if "*cheap*" human bodies be their sign of national prosperity; in short, if measures like this be to be the result of *Parliamentary reform*, better, far better, remain as we were, poor and oppressed; but not put upon a level with the beasts that perish, and see the flesh and bones of our relations, parents, wives, and children, tossed about to be

devoured by the fowls of the air; or, like the body of JEZEBEL, to be torn about by dogs. WARBURTON's is a miserable attempt to make us believe that the cutting-up is for the *benefit of the poor*, and that the law is to be impartial. The very *preamble* of the bill is false: and this I will now show to you in the words of a very eminent physician, who wrote to WARBURTON on the subject, when he brought in his first bill, and whose letter was published all over the country at the time. This physician *proved*, that the proposed law was not only *unnecessary* to a thorough knowledge of surgery; but that it was the contrary; that the *cutting up of human bodies* was *injurious* to the science of surgery. Here is his letter: I beg you to read it *with attention*. This physician recommends that which I recommend; namely, to make grave-robbing a *capital felony*. I pray you to read this letter: it will show you that that bloody practice is not at all necessary to the making of a man a skilful surgeon. If it were, I am prepared to prove, that this bill ought not to become a law: but first of all, read this letter; and you will be satisfied that the law is wholly unnecessary for the purpose for which it professes to be intended.

"*Cuilibet in arte sua credendum est.*"

"Sir,—As an ardently devoted and experienced member of the profession, pardon my questioning your philanthropy regarding the general expediency of 'Human Dissections.' He who has dissected and anatomised so much, from pure inclination, cannot reasonably be thought to be prejudiced against them. My firm conviction is, that they are by no means essential to the successful practice of the physician, nor, indeed, ordinary general practitioner.

"The study of anatomy and physiology (*i. e.* structure and function of the human body) I admit to be essential to the perfection of medical and surgical science. I repeat study, for the knowledge of both is perfectly attainable, without the aid of dissections, from our present fruits of them, in the way of preservations, engravings, explicit lectures, and scientific records.

"I canvass, primarily, the physician's vocation—and what have dissections performed for him? First, as to the knowledge of disease. Disease, at its onset, indeed throughout, consists mainly of functional derangement; and what discovery of function has been made through dissection? For by function the symp-

toms and distinctions of disease are elicited. The perfection of this vitally-important branch of the profession (pathology) is acquirable only by experience, which enables the physician to distinguish functional from organic affection. What information derived of vital function (*i.e.* brain, heart, lungs, stomach, and alimentary passages) by our minutest dissections? Has the discovery of injury of brain, after death, thrown any important light on the valued functions of its particular parts? Anatomy (*i.e.* dissections) throws no light whatever upon those prevailing and appalling maladies, St. Vitus's-dance, epilepsy, palsy, and apoplexy; and why? because, generally speaking, they are functional rather than organic affections. Much the same might be said of inflammations of mucous and serous surfaces, where life had been sacrificed to them; the blood, at the moment of dissolution, receding from arterial to venous cavities, leaving such surfaces more blanched than florid by it. Now this I affirm, not from mere prejudice or hypothesis, but experience. Again, consumption illustrates another ground of position, *viz.*, as to the ulceration of the lungs. We know full well, without the forlorn aid of dissections, or stethoscope itself, that ulceration is consequent upon the inflammation of mucous and serous surfaces; nay more, that such ulceration of internal and vital organs, almost without exception, is death. We prevent, therefore, but cannot cure consumption, as lamentable experience has taught us. In a word, we need not dissections to tell us that the organic affections of vital parts usually prove fatal. Be it no longer said that they are essential to successful practice; for it is most disreputable to science and the profession to have it supposed even that one consigned to our skill, should have expired without our knowledge (care being out of the question) of his malady.

"Seeing clearly our weapons must be such as to combat with morbid (*i.e.* deranged) function, it remains to be inquired what aids towards relief or cure have been derived through dissections? Our remedies, of any real efficacy at least, for the relief (cure, if you would rather) of functional derangement, are few; and these with a view to subdue inflammation, correct secret secretion, promote or restrain excretion, and give tone or vigour to the system. We are not assuredly indebted to dissections for our treatment of inflammation, morbid secretion, or debility; but rather to the lights of function and regimen, aided not a little by pathological and therapeutical experiences.

"I pass over the absurdity of medical testimony (grounded on dissections) in cases of abortion, rape, infanticide, idiotism, and insanity; and, from motives of delicacy, forbear the discussion of them. Under dread of poison, dissections at best are fallacious, and our knowledge derived more from chemical than anatomical acumen.

"Your 'report,' Sir, if I comprehend it

aright, is to the effect—first, that all must dissect to qualify them for successful practice; secondly, that the bodies of executed criminals are insufficient for the purpose; and, thirdly, that the repeal of such Act, and the substitution of another (confessedly more productive) are essential to the perfection of medical science, and the well-being of mankind.

"Now, first, as to the expediency! 'Tis obvious; pardon me, Sir, that by far too much importance has been attached to the testimony of Sir Astley Cooper and Mr. Abernethy, who are teachers of anatomy, and not physic, in London. I mean no disrespect nor disparagement towards these gentlemen; but why this stress upon their testimony? Sir A. C., after many years' painful and toilsome experiences, is doomed to confess that the operations are a reproach to surgery. Mr. A., to his honour be it said, has ever been opposed to them. It would be superfluous at this moment to speak of their physical attainments (apart, at any rate, from dissections and operations), notwithstanding I affirm that these, and not dissections, are the very bulwarks of surgery. It were as manifest as the 'sun at noon-day,' that bodies became needful in support of the college law and rage for dissections; but your honourable Committee required, *bona fide*, to know whether such dissections were demanded for the benefits of science and prosperity of the human race; for requisite assuredly they had made them for students passing college, or becoming licentiates of the Society of Apothecaries. I may humbly be permitted to suggest—teach students upon more rational and physical principles; require them to possess a sufficient classical education; sound physiological, pathological therapeutical, and chemical knowledge; and afford them ample physical and surgical experiences; then hopes may be entertained of their becoming expert and skilful practitioners.

"Be it not said, for mercy's sake, that we require many operative surgeons (when, in fact, were matters managed better, few, very few, indeed, would be needed); and let these be select, so that matured by much experience, they may be fully competent to the important duties thereof.

"Clinical experiences, beyond all your dissections, prove a treasure to the student; these eminently and truly teach him to distinguish between functional derangement and organic affection; to perceive the operation and the effects of remedies themselves, and, I had almost said, the divine influence of regimen. Emboldened by such, and the like, experiences, with confidence ere long he predicts the convalescence, or perchance the dissolution, of his patient. To sum up—the true doctrines of physic are founded upon unerring and fundamental principles; and such, believe me, as are eminently calculated to avert pending calamity; *i.e.* to supersede the necessity for operations, which, at best, are painful and calamitous to the afflicted.

"By
stone;
fections
dislocat
professi
mitous

"No

Sir, or
to rem
bodies
poses.
require
quirem
biologi
nism o
throug
servati
and dis
only up

"Mr

section

and the

ed mor

and aff

heartle

Forlor

tain s

throug

prejud

but fr

experi

origin

leave

behind

linger

perien

to the

gans.

such a

us at

To be

averse

shoul

adieu

devou

ture, f

have

Third

dissec

speak

them.

in the

scien

peace

your

name

uncal

we m

physi

privil

scien

ived

"I

esser

they

gery

by th

myth

"By the judicious treatment of gravel and stone; hernia and aneurisms; glandular affections and white swellings; fractures and dislocations; to the honour of science and the profession be it said, we save much and calamitous suffering in the world.

"Not to encroach upon your valuable time, Sir, or be thought prolix, I proceed, secondly, to remark, briefly, on the insufficiency of the bodies of executed criminals for scientific purposes. Immortality to our predecessors, we require not dissections at this day for the acquirement, much less the perfection, of physiological and physical science. The mechanism of the human body is amply displayed through the medium of engravings and preservations; and its functions, derangements, and diseases, are to be known and amended only upon the living body.

"Most unwillingly I advert to morbid dissections, the last refuge of the inexperienced, and the blot of our art. Few things have tended more to cast a stigma upon the profession, and afford a disrelish for dissections, than the heartless performance of them in private life. Forlorn, indeed our hope, if we expect to attain skill or eminence in the profession through such dissections. I speak not from prejudice, personality, or mere hypothesis, but from long and extensive observation and experience. Why most of our sudden deaths originating in derangement of vital functions, leave no traces of the source of dissolution behind them; and such as expire under more lingering indisposition, manifest to the experienced at least, organic affection peculiar to the structures of the affected organ or organs. We require not, therefore, to ascertain such appearances, nor would our doing so aid us at all in the knowledge or cure of them. To be brief—civilized beings naturally are averse to dissections; and God forbid they should ever become reconciled to them, or adieu to the ties of consanguinity, and those devoutly-to-be-admired sympathies of our nature, for which Britons, I am proud to confess, have been renowned from time immemorial. Thirdly, Sir, you resolve to legalize pauper dissections, after the provisions of foreigners, and speak of the advantages to be derived from them. The thing itself may be politic enough in the way of trade; but, for the honour of science, the credit of the profession, and the peace of society, I conjure you to pause ere your Committee sanction with their honoured names so degrading, and at the same time so uncalled-for an expedient. Since, however, we must model our practice and schools of physic after the fashion of the French, I claim privilege briefly to advert to the benefits which science and the profession hitherto have derived from them.

"In anatomy and physiology, it must be confessed, the French have excelled; but have they comparatively benefited physic or surgery by it? Have Drs. Gall and Spurzneim, by their minute dissections of the brain, added anything to our knowledge of it? We re-

quired not to know the seat and directions (nor indeed the functions) of its vast nerves and blood-vessels. Why, therefore, perplex ourselves about its mental developments, placed, doubtless, for the wisest of purposes, by an inscrutable Providence, beyond the reach or the scrutiny of man? Nor have we yet to learn,—thanks not to dissections, but experiences—that the brain's derangement of circulation is productive of correspondent derangement of function, and its organic affection, death. Bichat, Broussais, and Majendie, it is due to them to say, have called attention to mucous and serous surfaces, hitherto but insufficiently regarded (and imperfectly understood by many) in practice. Notwithstanding such acknowledged advantages, the French, I affirm, are inefficient practitioners. Do they not to this day, under the most acute inflammations (and inflammations, moreover, of vital organs), content themselves with ptisans, syrups, anodynes, leechings, and enemas, calculated for the relief only of particular symptoms, leaving the malady itself to commit its ravages upon the affected organ, or constitution generally? How calamitous the consequences of tampering with the inflammations of vital organs!—take, for example the lungs. Has not consumption afforded us a lesson; bid defiance to our every exertion, in spite of our discoveries and dissections; and are we still at a loss as to its origin, or the prevention (cure I maintain to be out of the question) of it? If not, why trifle (worse than trifle) with palliatives, which, under fevers and inflammations, (without more efficient measures) seal the doom of the patients? A breath as to their surgical eminence, and I am done. Baron Larrey and Dupuytren have distinguished themselves in surgery; but have they not been indebted mainly to their experiences? The former had most extensive field and hospital practice during the campaigns of the immortal Buonaparte; and the latter for many years has been engaged in the performance of vast hospital duties, being at this moment chief surgeon to the Hotel Dieu, in France.

"Impressed with the firmest conviction (inspired by an almost unparalleled devotedness to the profession) that experience, and by no means dissections, qualify alone for successful practice, I have been induced to impart these solemn convictions to you, Sir, in justice to a much-injured profession, and compassion towards a suffering public, whose condition (in lieu of the Act contemplated) you would best ameliorate by rendering exhumation felony, and quackery fraud.

"Finally, Sir, would mankind benefit their health or condition in society, I conjure them, without delay, to petition Parliament against a measure confessedly uncalled for, and fraught with sufferance and degradation to them. 'Virtus in actione consistit.'

"I have the honour to be, Sir,

"Your obedient humble servant,

"WM. HORSLEY, M.D.

"North Shields, Dec. 1828."

Now, my friends, observe, that *no answer was ever given to this letter.* DOCTOR PAYNE, an eminent physician of Nottingham, has just published a letter, sent by him to WARBURTON, expressing similar opinions, and concluding with the following words :

"There appears to be a path now presenting itself, by which the detestable crimes of burking and violating the remains of the dead may be no longer practised. The remains of murderers should as usual be given for dissection, but the bodies of none others; and transportation for those who steal or receive dead bodies. A law should also be passed to compel the teaching of anatomy by the artificial subject as in France.

"I hope the idea of giving up the bodies of the unclaimed dead will be immediately abandoned, as it increases the exasperation which is constantly souring the minds of the working and middle classes, and rendering it unsafe to dwell in the land. It reminds them of the words of Southey the poet :—

"Wretched is the infant's lot,
Born within the straw-roof'd cot;
Be he generous, wise, or brave,
He must only be a slave!
Long, long labour, little rest,
Still to toil to be oppressed;
Drain'd by taxes of his store,—
Punished next for being poor.
This is the poor wretch's lot,
Born within the straw-roof'd cot."

"Yes, the people make their remarks,
'When we have lost our all, and have out-
'lived our friends and relations, our bodies
'are to be given up for dissection!'

"I remain, with much respect,

"Yours respectfully,

"H. PAYNE, M.D.

'Nottingham, Dec. 10, 1831.'

Thus, then, the *preamble* of the bill is false: this cutting up of human bodies is *unnecessary to the learning of surgery*. But now, if it *were necessary* to the perfection of that science, still a law like this ought not to be passed; and nothing ought to be done tending to put the bodies of the people on a *level with the bodies of beasts*. The assertion of the advocates of this carcass-cutting system is this: that unless the carcass and cutting fellows be allowed to carry on their practices, the knowledge of surgery *will be imperfect*; and that, therefore, the hacking and bloody practice must continue, and dead human bodies (to use the vulgar and unfeeling phrase of HUME) must become "*cheap*" in the market; or that some complaints

to which we are liable must remain *without a cure*, and that many persons would, of course, *die sooner than they would die*, if the cutting and hacking system continued, and if HUME's *cheap human flesh* continued amply to supply the market.

This is the *ASSERTION* on which WARBURTON, HUME, DENMAN, and the rest of them, ground their project for making human bodies "*CHEAP*," as HUME calls it; and the bill, taken along with this argument of these men, will, if it become a law, say this to the nation: "Your dead bodies must be made *to come cheap* to those who deal in them and cut them up; or *some of you will die sooner than you otherwise would die.*" This is the sum total of all that they have to say. HUME has *totted* the matter up; and this is the "*tottal*" of it. And now, my friends, hear *my answer* to these advocates of *free trade* in your flesh, blood, and bones.

FIRST of all; we have not only the *opinions* of Dr. HORSLEY against the *utility* of the butchery, but his *opinion* that it is *mischievous*; and he produces other high authorities in support of his opinions. But we have his *reasons* in support of the opinions; and we have, as far as I have observed, had *no answer* to these reasons.

NEXT; if this cutting-up work be so necessary, so indispensable, to the learning of surgery; how comes it that this *did not use to be the case*? How comes it that this traffic in human bodies, that the making of human flesh and bones "*cheap*," as HUME calls it, was never found to be necessary BEFORE? Men's bodies have always been constructed as they are now; they have always been subject to the same ailments that they are subject to now; life has always been valued as highly as it is now; and yet never until now was this cutting up and hacking to pieces of the dead people deemed necessary to the health of the living people; and never until now did a band of surgeons take it into their heads to apply to the government to *set aside the ancient law of the land*, in order that they

might
to cut
sure!
law: i
and fif
that it
BOUR
ING th
OF TH
up, are
this W
means
poor, w
Sturges
a stop
making
BURD
oversee
young
from b
a law
their d
pieces
them!

So r
to sho
human
as Dr.
anybo
he say
most
profes
that a
medic
sure
and t
at thi
settin
horri
and
the
bodie
dead
HUM
to th
that
to c
them
you
wou
for
falle
whe
sho
mm

might have *free trade in human bodies*, to cut up and hack about at their pleasure! This is like the case of the *poor law*: it did very well for *two hundred and fifty years*; but now it is found out that it *does harm*, and that STURGES BOURNE'S BILLS, and HARNESSING the poor, and that DISPOSING OF THEIR DEAD BODIES to be cut up, are necessary. Strange thing, that this WARBURTON should tell us, that he means his law *for the benefit of the poor*, while he talks of no law to *repeal Sturges Bourne's Bills*; no law to put a stop to the *harnessing* of them, and *making them draw like BEASTS OF BURDEN*; no law to prevent *hired overseers* from cutting off the hair of young girls; no law to prevent them from being treated like *beasts*; and only a law to make it no crime to receive their dead bodies and to hack them to pieces; and this too *out of kindness to them*!

So much for *authority and experience* to show that the horrible traffic in human flesh is not necessary. Indeed, as Dr. HORSLEY says, it is of no use to anybody but illiterate quacks: it is, as he says, the *scandal and disgrace* of a most learned, honourable, and useful profession. ROUSSEAU said long ago, that a great increase of the number of medical and surgical practitioners was a sure sign of the *decay of a nation*: and this is one of the signs of our decay at this moment. But, all this aside; setting all these arguments against the horrible practice down for nothing; and admitting the above assertion of the advocates of *free trade in human bodies* to be *true*: admitting that your dead bodies must, in the words of HUME and DENMAN, be made "*cheap*" to those who cut them up: admitting that "*your dead bodies must be made to come cheap to those who deal in them and cut them up, or that some of you would die sooner than you otherwise would die.*" I deny it; but, let us, for argument's sake, *admit it in its fullest extent*; and then let us see, whether it be not far better that we should be exposed to the endurance of some, and even to great *bodily ills*; and

that some, and even many of us, *should die sooner* than we should if the horrible butchery were to go on: the question is, whether this would not *be preferable* to the suffering of this traffic to continue: whether it would not *be better* for us to endure these ills, and be subject to these dangers, than to insure, even to INSURE, ourselves against them, by sanctioning this horrible traffic in dead bodies? This is the question: and this question every man that has anything of real humanity left about him, every man who cannot coolly *tot-up* the value of human feelings, will, without any hesitation, not only answer in the affirmative, but will feel somewhat offended at the question being put to him.

Those who make the above-stated assertion, and who, on its being admitted, seem to think it *conclusive* for their purpose, proceed upon the truly base idea, that there is *NOTHING SO VALUABLE AS LIFE*; an idea just upon a level with the instinctive feeling of the most insensible of brutes. But, is this the idea of those who are worthy to be called *men and women*? Where is the man (worthy of that name) who would not prefer the death of a wife or daughter to her prostitution; where is the man (worthy of that name) who would not prefer his own death to his assent to such prostitution? In thousands of instances, men (and working men too) have gone to certain death, rather than live with the reproach of having betrayed other men. There is, then, *something more valuable than life*; and is the value of life, then, to be put in competition with the value of *all those feelings which distinguish men from brutes*? And all, yea all, these feelings must be banished from the breast, before the mind will cease to contemplate with reverence and awe the remains of the dead.

As to the CHRISTIAN RELIGION, it is pure, not hypocrisy, but sheer impudence, to pretend to believe that it can long exist in a country where *the law* makes human bodies the subject of open traffic, where it authorizes the cutting of them up, the ripping and hacking

of them to pieces, with no more ceremony than the cutting-up of the bodies of sheep and pigs. We all know, for we have all first or last felt, that the bare sight of a dead human body fills us with serious thoughts, and that even a funeral, passing by, has, in some degree, the same effect. Can this continue to be the case, if it shall become a fact familiar to every mind, that a human body has belonging to it nothing more sacred than the body of a hog or a dog? People of all the sects of Christians have been careful to set apart places for the burial of the dead. However they disagree in other matters, they are all of accord in this, to reverence the remains of the dead. But how is this feeling to exist, when they shall know that the *trade in dead bodies is free*; and that, as Sir ROBERT INGLIS states it, there are always "EIGHT HUNDRED MEN in London" engaged in *learning how to cut human bodies to pieces!*"

If this law pass, what becomes of the "*consecration of ground?*" What becomes of the *Church Service*? What becomes of the *Rubrick*; what of "*the burial of the dead?*" Dispense with *that*; declare, by *law*, that that is *useless*; and, then, where will there be to be found even a parson, though with half-a-dozen benefices, brazen enough to tell any of the people of any of his parishes, that *any part* of the Book of Common Prayer is worthy of their attention? What, if a law like this be passed, will any parson, after that, demand *fees* for saying *prayers over dead bodies*? It is as well, for *morals and religion*, that those bodies be sold and cut up, as that they be buried in a church-yard with the usual solemnities; or, it is not. If the latter, the intended law is *injurious to morals and religion*: if the former, we have long *been paying burial fees merely to fatten the parsons*. In short, it must be evident to every man who reflects but for a moment, that a belief in a future state of existence is impossible to be kept alive, for any length of time, in a country where the law makes (as law would make) no distinction in the treatment of

the dead body of a man and that of the dead body of a horse; both being alike articles of traffic; both being openly cut up for the use of the purchaser; both being hacked about with an equal absence of all ceremony.

We all know the *power of habit*; we all know that the blackest crimes proceed from *small beginnings*; theft, robbery, burglary, murder, is generally the march. The habit of our thoughts has made the most of men hesitate at the commission of the last horrid crime: they have hitherto seen something in a human body that held back their hands: but when, as in the case of the monster BISHOP, they have been *accustomed* to consider human bodies as nothing more sacred than those of pigs and sheep, what is to restrain them from resorting to the killing of those bodies? This bill may, perhaps, not *directly*, authorise the selling of the bodies of poor people dying in poor-houses and hospitals and prisons; but that such are the *tendency and intention* of it nobody can doubt. It is well known, that the *rich* have the means of *protecting* the dead bodies of their relations, and that the poor have not. And where is the man so brutal as to say that his heart is not chilled with the thought of proclaiming openly to the unfortunate poor, that their carcases when dead are to be sold for dissection? What! is there a man in England to propose this? And is this proposition to be made even to the Parliament, and that too in a country where the depositories of the dead, and the decent interment of dead bodies, have always been objects of such attention? Are there men hardy enough for this? What! the poor labourer, who, after having toiled all his life; after having brought himself to death, at a premature old age, very likely, by the excess of his toil; is he, because in his old age he is compelled to resort to the parish for relief, to be harassed in his last moments with the thought that in a few minutes the butchers will have their knives in his belly, and be hacking and chopping him to pieces like the carcase of a dead dog? Oh! no. England will never see this. Is the husband

to se
butch
ter-h
ful d
the g
see
see t
cart
The
it w
worth
not t
Th
have
their
such
into
vidin
THE
THO
DEA
everl
lastin
derec
Ref
able
view
to m
in th
appa
"R
will
the
bill
will
will
hond
by a
wou
N
all
fave
to p
my
this
its
den
wh
the

to see his dead wife taken away in the butcher's cart, and carried to the slaughter-house, instead of having the mournful duty to perform of following her to the grave? Are fathers and mothers to see their children, and are children to see their parents, tossed into the bloody cart and carried away for dissection? The very thought fills me, and I trust it will fill every Englishman who is worthy of the name, with indignation not to be expressed.

The working people in the country have given the best possible proof of their abhorrence of any law, having such a tendency, by forming themselves into CLUBS for the purpose of providing the means of WATCHING THEIR OWN GRAVES, AND THOSE OF THEIR NEAR AND DEAR RELATIONS; a fact to their everlasting honour, and to the everlasting disgrace of those who have rendered this measure necessary. Talk of *Reform*, indeed! The people will be able easily to estimate the character and views of those "*Reformers*" who want to make dead human bodies "*cheap*" in the dissecting market! This is now, apparently, become a measure of the "*Reforming Ministry*." The people will at last have to rely, I dare say, upon the Lords again; and if they drive this bill from them with indignation, they will not only act justly, but wisely; and will, by this one act, do more for the honour and stability of *their order*, than by all the other means that human wit would be able to devise.

Now, my friends, keep your eye on all those whom you perceive to be in favour of this bill. I will do my best to place them safely upon record. For my part, my determination is, that if this bill pass, to do my utmost to cause its repeal, and never to hold any confidential intercourse with any one of those who may have supported it. And in the meanwhile I remain your friend,

WM. COBBETT.

WONDERFUL CHANGES.

TO THE READERS OF THE REGISTER.

Manchester, Jan. 21, 1832.

MY FRIENDS,

You have, in numerous instances, seen me abused or ridiculed for years together by those who have, at last, become the advocates of the very opinions, for the promulgating of which they have abused and ridiculed and despitefully treated me; and you have never seen any one of these my revilers accompany his conversion by confessing his former errors and injustice. Such is conspicuously the case at this moment. The "*order of the day*" seems to be *poor-laws for Ireland!* The *Quarterly Review*, my old and constant calumniator; the far greater part of the BROADSHEET, and especially the *Morning Chronicle*, all are for *poor-laws for Ireland!* Mr. SADLER, the Duke of Newcastle's member, and now a candidate for Leeds, brings forward a petition for *poor-laws for Ireland*; and says, that for years he has stood alone in advocating the measure! I'll be sworn for you, that not one in a hundred of you ever heard of Mr. SADLER, except as an advocate for the *penal laws against the Catholics*, and for the *continuance of rotten boroughs*. But you have long witnessed my efforts on the side of *poor-laws for Ireland*, and have long heard me abused and ridiculed for those efforts.

In 1812, when the Catholics were pressing their claims to what was called *emancipation*, I urged the adoption of *poor-laws for Ireland*, insisting, that without those, *emancipation* could be of no use; and I never called for *emancipation* without expressly calling for *poor-laws* at the same time. In 1822, I refused to subscribe for the relief of the Irish, telling the parish-collectors, that it would only be *giving my money to the savage Irish landowners*, who ought to be made to give relief to the poor of Ireland as we relieved the poor of England. At the Kent meeting, in 1828, I offered a petition, in which the same sentiment was expressed. In 1829, when the *Emancipation Bill* was before Parliament, I said it would be of

no use without poor-laws. When the bill had been passed, I petitioned the Parliament to repeal the *Protestant hierarchy and pass poor-laws*; for that, without these, Ireland must become more troubled than ever. And that, with regard to the general principles of the poor-laws, how invariably have I supported them; and when have I failed to express my hatred of MALTHUS, of STURGES BOURNE, and of every other man who has done or said anything tending to cause the poor-law of England (the great original poor-law) to be chipped away? The *Register* of 1818 contains (I forget the precise date) a letter to the hardened PARSON MALTHUS in defence of this sacred law, this *Magna Charta* of the working millions; in 1826, I published the POOR MAN'S FRIEND (to which Dr. Doyle refers Mr. O'CONNELL), establishing the RIGHT to parochial relief in all cases of want of the necessaries of life. In short, during the last twenty years, it has formed no small part of the labours of my laborious life to maintain and enforce this great and undoubted right: so that, unless Mr. SADLER wrote on the subject more than twenty years ago, he certainly now puts forward a claim wholly unfounded; and upon what ground does he say that he has "stood alone" in advocating poor-laws for Ireland?

But now, suffer me to take an article from the *Morning Chronicle* of the 17th instant. You have read Mr. O'CONNELL's very strange speech on this subject, and Dr. DOYLE's letter to him on that speech. The *Morning Chronicle* remarks on these; and then it goes on to remark on an article in the *Quarterly Review*, containing a commentary on the pamphlet of a *Prig* of the name of SENIOR, who is a professor of "*Poleetical Economy*;" that is to say, a Scotch fellow who wants to chip away our poor-laws, that our labourers may be compelled to live on potatoes, in order that fellows like this may have plenty of meat without being forced to work for it: just like MALTHUS, who, while he urged the Parliament to take all relief from the working people, got

a pension for himself, to be paid by those working people. The QUARTERLY REVIEWERS expose the folly and the falseness of this impudent Scotch fellow, SENIOR; and the *Chronicle* publishes extracts from the commentary, merely interspersed with very just remarks of its own. I shall now insert the whole of this article. The parts in the larger letter are the remarks of the *Chronicle*; those in the smaller are from the *Review*. Pray, read the whole with attention, and you will almost think that you are reading *old Registers*.

1. In an account of the proceedings of the Irish National Union, on Thursday last, which we have extracted from the *Dublin Morning Register*, will be found a speech of Mr. O'CONNELL, in answer to Dr. DOYLE's letter to him on the subject of the poor-laws. Much of the argument of Mr. O'CONNELL has not so much reference to the general question as the particular grounds on which he was attacked by Dr. DOYLE. With respect to the general question, it does not appear to us that Mr. O'CONNELL has offered any other argument against the establishment of poor-laws, than that tribunals must be established to determine whether the persons claiming relief are entitled to it, and that the poor must in consequence be the slaves of such tribunals. This is rather a fine-spun argument against the solid grounds in favour of a plan, by which alone the miserable peasantry can be secured against the caprice and mismanagement of the landowner, and the peace of the country can be preserved. Mr. O'CONNELL has no other panacea than the repeal of the Union. What the effect of such a measure might be we will not now consider, as we wish to confine our speculations to means compatible with the existing constitution. Mr. O'CONNELL himself has said that he wishes the repeal merely as a means to an end, and that end is the prosperity of Ireland. If the prosperity of Ireland can be secured under the Union, the repeal in that case becomes unnecessary.

2. But nothing is more certain than that, without compulsory poor-rates, the mass of the people of Ireland must con-

tinue in a state of destitution, from which they cannot by any possibility extricate themselves, and the law must always remain a dead letter in a country in which the people have not an interest in enforcing it.

3. Mr. O'CONNELL wishes to secure the liberty of the Irish. No word has been more abused than *liberty*. In a perfect social system there can be no liberty; for liberty supposes the absence of all restraint, and under a good social system our liberty is necessarily limited by our mutual rights and mutual obligations. Ireland furnishes a flagrant instance of violation of several of the principles essential to a good social system—namely, the existence of rights without corresponding obligations. The soil of a country belongs to the inhabitants of that country; and if the ownership be given to individuals, it ought always to be understood, on the condition that the ownership is exercised in such a way as shall be for the benefit of the nation. But in Ireland the owner can avail himself of the competition of the wretched inhabitants for the possession of land as a means of existence, while he is relieved from all responsibility with regard to them. In the *Quarterly Review*, just published, there is an able article on SENIOR's letter on the Irish poor, in which a poor-law is shown to be essentially necessary to the well-being both of Ireland and England. Alluding to the point which we have been now examining, the reviewer observes:—

4. A country, the bulk of whose population is insufficiently supplied with the coarsest kind of food, annually sends away from her shores that enormous quantity of the very produce of her land, for want of which her own population are dying by inches, their lives shortened—as is proved by the mean duration of life in that country, as compared to England—to one-fourth of their natural term! How are we to explain the fearful paradox? For whose advantage is it that this mass of food leaves the country before the pressing wants of its inhabitants are half satisfied? For that of those whom *the law* invests with the ownership of the land. But the right of the inhabitants of a country to be permitted to earn a maintenance from it, if they can, by their own exertions, is a sacred right. Equally in vain is it that the economists quote the favourite dogma which they so often put forward, certainly

without comprehending its multitudinous limitations, that it is mischievous to give by law any artificial direction to employment or capital—that people must be left to apply their resources in their own way, and they will be certain to do so in that which is best for the community at large. We should be glad to know what it is that at present disables a stout Irishman from providing subsistence for himself and his family, by the labour of his own good right arm, on the nearest plot of earth, but the artificial impediment *already* placed by law in the way of the natural direction of his industry? Whilst the *law* thus interferes by wholesale to appropriate all the soil of the country, and all the wealth that is found on or under its surface, shall the legislature scruple to interfere in the appropriation of a fractional part of that soil or wealth, in order to save thousands from perishing by want? and this upon the score that *all* interference, forsooth, is contrary to sound principle? Shall we thus swallow the camel and strain at the gnat? How are we to characterise a law which ties up men's hands from helping themselves, and renders them no help in compensation? If I tether a horse in a corner, and prevent it from grazing, and yet bring it no food, am I not guilty of its death as much as if I slaughtered it?

5. Ireland never will be in a sound state so long as the law regards not the welfare of the people, but considers merely a comparatively small number of individuals the owners of the soil. But the connexion with England has even deprived the Irish peasantry of a material corrective of the abuse of the power of landowners; for it has freed the landowners from the apprehensions at all times to be entertained from the rising of a population in a state of destitution. The people of England guarantee to the Irish landlord the collection of his rents, however exorbitant, so that he may proceed undauntedly in his career of picking the peasantry to the backbone, in full reliance on English bayonets.

6. But the people of England do not merely suffer in being obliged to repress the disorders caused by the exemption from responsibility of the Irish landowners. The burdens of the English are increased by the destitution in which the Irish are suffered to exist. And here the people of England have right to insist on a remedy for the evil entailed on them by the difference between the laws of the two countries regarding the poor.

7. The slowness with which many Irish landlords (observes the Reviewer) are induced to see the advantage to their country and to themselves, of a compulsory assessment on their property for the relief and employment of its poor, may be intelligible. They look to its immediate effect—to the rate of one, two, or perhaps three shillings in the pound on their rental—and they shut their eyes to the ultimate policy of the measure, and their ears to the cries of the afflicted, and their hearts to the influence of pity, and their understandings to that of justice. But how is it that the English do not bestir themselves more actively? It does not surely require much penetration in an English farmer, to perceive that he is competing with his Irish rival in his own markets at a grievous disadvantage, after paying a heavy poor-rate, from which the other is exempt, and high wages to his labourers, whilst the labourer of the Irish farmer, having no other resource from starvation, must be content with a miserable pittance. Surely no English landlord can be blind to the fact that, under these circumstances, prices of produce in the markets of Liverpool, Manchester, Bristol, and London, which may afford a rent to the Irish landlord, and a profit to the Irish cultivator, will scarcely pay the English poor-rate on the same quality of soil, and put rent and profit out of all question. He can hardly avoid seeing, that so long as there is perfect freedom of intercourse between the two countries, for men and goods, the Irish poor must either directly or indirectly be maintained out of the English poor-rates, and the high rents of Ireland come in great part out of the English poor-rates, and the high rents of Ireland come in great part out of the English landowner's pocket. It was an oversight, no doubt, in the landed interest of Great Britain, not to have insisted, in 1807, on the land of the three kingdoms being put in this respect on an equal footing, before the duties on the importation of Irish produce were taken off. But is it possible that they have not yet opened their eyes to the error, and made up their minds to insist on its rectification? Can any claim be more just or reasonable? Goods and persons pass with unlimited freedom between the two countries. But in one, the land is heavily burdened to provide for the necessities of the labouring class—in the other, there is no such provision. The natural consequence is, that the poor of the latter resort in crowds to the former island to avoid starvation, undersell the natives in the over-thronged markets for labour, and drive them upon the poor-rates of their parishes. Had Ireland the same poor-laws as England, why should there be any difference in the rate of wages of the two countries? or why should the Irish migrate to England, rather than the English to Ireland?

8. Were there no other reasons in favour of poor-laws, the interest which they necessarily give to the rich to im-

prove the condition of the poor, both physically and morally, ought to recommend them to all philanthropists. The rich are soon reminded, when they neglect their duties to the poor, that *they cannot themselves exist in comfort while the poor are not in a state of comfort. What a lesson is taught by the fires of the incendiary!* An Irish landlord might strike terror into a district for the sake of a few offenders, turning hundreds adrift to perish by the waysides. *But in England the people cannot be got rid of*, and the truth in time forces itself on the better classes, that they will suffer more by neglecting the poor than by ameliorating their condition. When contagious distempers exist either in the moral or physical world, the rich must, for their own sakes, seek to remove the cause of the distempers. Ever since the appearance of the cholera, increased attention has been paid to the condition of the poor, and pains have been taken to impress on them the advantages of cleanliness and sobriety. The torch of the incendiary has, in like manner, roused the occupiers of the soil, and impressed them with the necessity of *guarding against the abuses in the administration of the poor-laws, which led to the discontent, in which the fires originated.* OUT OF EVIL COMETH GOOD. We are assured that, in many places, a *great improvement in the circumstances of the poor has been the consequence.* The abuses themselves are not to be defended, and *they lead to their own remedy.*

9. Can any two things (says the Reviewer) be more distinct than the giving an allowance to a farmer's labourer already fully employed, under pretence of aiding him to support his wife and children, and the setting a man to work when wholly destitute of employment? Is it not clear that the first practice tends to throw the maintenance of every labourer's family upon the parish; breaks down all distinction between paupers and ordinary labourers, between relief and wages; permits employers to lower the wages they choose to offer down to a bare maintenance for the man alone, without losing his services; alters the whole complexion and condition of the labouring class, by apportioning the income of each individual, not to his character, skill, and industry, but to the size of his family; thus naturally giving rise to the terrific and daily-

increasing evils which are found wherever the system of supplementing wages prevails? But, on the contrary, none of these consequences can be urged against the mode of relief by "setting to work" the unemployed and able-bodied. This is not only a different practice, but it is, in every way, the very reverse of the other. It leaves untouched and uninterfered with all the remainder of the class—all but the few who are actually without any employment; these are set to work on some public improvement—as a road, canal, &c. They are taken out of the market for labour, and no longer compete with the other labourers, or influence, in any manner, the current rate of wages, which settles itself on its true principles, according to the work wanted and done. Whatever number of labourers are found to remain permanently in this way on the parish, they mark the extent of its *surplus* labour, and offer an obvious motive to the parish to devise some means of removing them, by emigration or otherwise. In the meantime, they receive for their *parish work* bare *parish pay*, and are thus placed, both as to character and circumstances, in a lower grade than the labourers who work for private employers. There is, therefore, an obvious inducement for them to endeavour to obtain private employment, if possible—to struggle to keep themselves off the parish. A broad and wholesome line of demarcation is drawn between the pauper and the common labourer, and the mischiefs of the allowance system are wholly prevented. If Mr. SENIOR cannot perceive the difference between these two systems (and he will see them practically exemplified in Sussex and Northumberland), he surely ought not to venture to write on subjects he must be incompetent to elucidate. If he can discriminate between them, often as the distinction has been drawn, what are we to say of his candour and fairness?"

10. On every principle of justice, the English and Scotch are entitled to be relieved from the burden entailed on Britain by the absence of poor-laws in Ireland. The immigration of Irish poor into this country tends greatly to deteriorate the condition of the English labourers, and to add to the burden of parishes. But putting England and Scotland out of consideration, Ireland itself can never know tranquillity till the great body of the people have a hold on the owners of the soil. We have always maintained that the plans for giving relief merely to the sick and aged would fail to be beneficial, and that it is of the essence of a good system of poor-laws to compel the rich to find work for the poor, or to enable them to find work. The Reviewer

forcibly observes, in answer to an objection of Mr. SENIOR's, that the whole rental of Ireland, if distributed among the labourers, would give to each only five shillings a week:—

11. Was there ever so unjust and inappropriate an argument? Here the whole net produce of the land is supposed to be given up to the poor unconditionally, and no new produce created in its place. If we advocated an Agrarian law like this, well indeed might Mr. SENIOR and the Irish landlords dissent from us. But they must well know that what we propose is, that the sums raised as poor-rate (and so far a deduction from rent) be strictly, and economically, and judiciously applied in the employment of the now idle able-bodied poor, on works of public and private utility, such as it has been over and over again proved, if undertaken in Ireland, will *create new wealth* infinitely exceeding the outlay, and ultimately, indeed very shortly, add to the rents of the landlords a great deal more than it takes from them. Is there any similitude between the two propositions? Between the *giving away* the whole, or a portion, of an Irish landlord's rental, and the requiring him to expend a portion of it in setting to work the now idle beggars and plunderers infesting his estate, in permanent improvements of that estate, or of the neighbourhood, which will infallibly, under good management, bring him in before long a high *profit* on the outlay? It is quite clear, that those persons who oppose the introduction of a law into Ireland, compelling the setting to work of the unemployed able-bodied poor, on the same grounds as Mr. SENIOR, either wilfully or blindly mistake the proposition. So far from thinking that this is a part of the English poor-law which can or ought to be omitted in its application to Ireland, we consider it to be the very essence of the system required by that country. Relief for the sick and aged is quite a secondary consideration. If the able-bodied are sure of employment at sufficient wages, they will generally be able to maintain their infirm and old relations. Dispensaries and hospitals are necessary enough, but they reach not the real evil which afflicts that unhappy land. The curse of Ireland is the general want of employment for its inhabitants, and their consequent idle and unproductive vagrancy, habits of plunder, occasional starvation, disease, despair, and turbulence. Any poor-law applied to Ireland, that merely provided relief for the sick, without containing, as its foremost provision, that essential feature in a law of relief, the setting to work every man capable of work who has no means whereby to maintain himself, the rendering labour a condition to be fulfilled before subsistence be administered, will be not only useless, but deeply, ruinously injurious. Such a poor-law would indeed prove in practice to be "confiscation and an Agrarian law." Every stout peasant would lie idle in bed till he became qualified for parish

relief as sick and impotent, and would thenceforward never be found out of his bed by the overseer. Ireland would be turned into one great infirmary, and the rental of the landowners be consumed by the poor without the possibility of any return.

Now, my friends, readers of the *Register*, what do you say to *that*? Say! why that the *Chronicle* and the *Review* are a couple of *thieving* publications; that they have stolen my thoughts, and that they have been unable to put them on paper in so good a way as I should have done. That is what you will say. But, besides this, what will you, or, rather, what will DENMAN say to DOCTOR BLACK, when that surprisingly clever *Attorney-GENERAL* shall have read paragraph EIGHT. Pray read it again, and look well at the words, that I have put in *italics*! What! does not the Doctor remember that I was prosecuted for saying that the "*FIRES had done GOOD!*" And what does the Doctor say here? Why, the very same thing; only he says it without any qualification at all, and without any other part of his paper containing anything *condemning* the setting of fire, which my paper did. He says, that *the torch of the incendiary* was put in motion by *discontent*; that this discontent arose from *abuses* (committed by magistrates and others) in *administering the poor-laws*; that the *consequence* of the fires has been an *improvement in the condition of the poor*; that thus, "*OUT OF EVIL COMETH GOOD*;" that the abuses are not to be defended, and that they *lead to the fires*, which are *the remedy for them*! And this, observe, while the fires are blazing away with more fury than ever. Ah! but the Doctor is not "*a labourer*" of St. Clement Danes, as poor miserable toiling I was, of "*Saint Dunstan's-in-the-West*." The *Doctor* is one of the petty noblesse: he is a *dignitary*: it was I that made him so, to be sure; but, really, if he go on at this rate, I must cancel his diploma; and he will not be able to get one from an English university, unless he can produce a certificate that he is more than half an idiot; nor from a Scotch university, unless he be willing to give a cast coat or an old pair of shoes, or can afford the price of

a bullock's liver; neither of which, would he, who knows them well, give for the knowledge in all the skulls of all the gangs of professors. So let him take care if he mean to keep the much-envied station in which I had the generosity to place him.

TO MR. O'CONNELL.

Manchester, 21st Jan. 1832.

SIR,

NEVER liking to go in a *crowd*, especially to the *attack*, I shall not trouble you with the remarks which I intended to make on the closing part of your speech against the poor-laws for Ireland. Except upon this one subject, you will find no additional opponent in me. In the instance of Lord CLONCURRY, I hope that you both go far beyond the mark; and it is now for the first time that I learn that there has been any disagreement between you. I heartily approve of all your endeavours to humble, to pull down, to drag in the dirt, the stupid, haughty, and insolent men who affect to consider you to be their *inferior*; and though I doubt (considering the state of their *concern*) whether it be *worth your while* to trouble yourself with them, still they deserve so much pulling down at your hands, and I so like to see them pulled down, that I cannot call upon you to stay your hand, save only in a case where to pull them down, *the country must be injured*; and such a case is the *poor-law question*. Besides, do you think that *they want poor-laws in Ireland*? Not a man of them. They are under the influence of the *Malthusian crew of Scotch economists*. Instead of giving poor-laws to Ireland, *they want to take them from England*, at which they have been working for the last twenty years; and the most effectual way of working them, is, to demand for Ireland, none of the Sturges Bourne stuff; but old Betsey's Bill, which Ireland ought to have had *two hundred years ago*; as I have so clearly proved in "*Protestant Reformation*" and "*Poor Man's Friend*."

But, I beseech you, leave the *business*,

for awhile, to BROUGHAM AND VAUX, SPRING RICE, and PROUD STANLEY, and do, pray, take a look at the proceedings of a meeting, held at LEEDS, in *Old England*, on the 12th of this present month of January, 1832. Here you will find matter to delight every good Irishman and every good Englishman too. The meeting was called by the Mayor, for the purpose of taking into consideration the subject of a petition to Parliament praying for the establishment of poor-laws in Ireland. Mr. SADLER, who is well known as a member of the Duke of Newcastle, who is also well known to be a native of Leeds, and who is a reform-candidate for that town in opposition to BABBINGTON MACAULAY, who is a son of old SIERRA LEONE ZACHARY, and who is, you know, one of Lord Lansdowne's members for the dead-ripe borough of CALNE, in Wiltshire. This Babbington has the support of one BAINES, proprietor of the *Leeds Mercury*, who, in fact, put BROUGHAM and VAUX into Parliament for Yorkshire, and who is, you know, called the GREAT LIAR OF THE NORTH; a name, which on account of his publications, he most richly deserves. You now know the parties. The proceedings began by a friend of Mr. SADLER moving the following resolution.

"That in the opinion of this meeting, some system of parochial relief, which shall be compulsory on the owners of property in Ireland, is absolutely necessary, and that petitions be sent from the borough of Leeds to the two Houses of Parliament, praying for the establishment of some legal provision for the poor of Ireland, and that the same be presented by Lord Harewood to the House of Lords, and by Mr. Sadler to the House of Commons."

BAINES, in order to thwart SADLER, and, thereby to support MACAULAY, was obliged to do something to keep SADLER from carrying off this large bunch of laurel. A negative would not do by any means; mitigated poor-laws would not do; it demanded something of a very decided character. SADLER presented the meeting with a bold and grand attack on the *estates of the Irish landlords*; and BAINES saw that there

was no surpassing this but by an attack, equally grand, on the *estates of the Church!* Accordingly, a friend of BAINES moved, as an amendment, the following resolution:

"That a petition be presented to both Houses of Parliament, praying that they will not saddle Ireland with a poor-law until all the church property that formerly belonged to the poor of that country be, by legislative enactment, appropriated to the purpose for which it was intended, namely, to feed the hungry and clothe the naked, but that in their wisdom they would appropriate such property to the relief of the poor."

Well you may rub your eyes! Don't rub them out, however; for you have a pretty deal stronger stuff than this to come. This motion was *finally carried* by a vast majority; and SADLER, who evidently saw that it would, took his revenge before-hand, in a long and able speech in support of the original motion. BAINES, in the absence of BABBINGTON MACAULAY, answered SADLER. I will now insert a large part of both their speeches, which you will find to contain really "*high matter*," as Burke would have called it. I copy them, word for word, from a paper called the *Leeds Intelligencer*; and I put them in larger print than I generally do matter thus republished, because I wish them to be read with ease.

MR. SADLER.

"Instead of making the poor wretched people who may be going about knowing not where to earn a morsel of food the victims, not of crimes, but of misfortune, and of all those vicissitudes by which men are reduced to penury and wretchedness, dependent on the eleemosynary gifts of individuals, and the accidental charities of benevolent bodies, the superfluous wealth of the country, whether in the hands of ecclesiastics or laymen, should assist the diseased, the distressed, and the aged—(applause);—and not as a matter of favour, not as a matter of consideration, but as a matter of right: for I am one of those who hold that the poorest man in this

country in a state of distress has as just and equitable a claim for relief as has the proudest peer in this empire to his ample domains. (Applause.) Then, gentlemen, what does that proposition amount to? I have already told you that *I am for the abolition of tithes*; but I tell you that if you give the whole amount of the tithes to the poor it is insufficient to relieve the whole of the distress in Ireland. ("No, no," "Yes, yes.") I say it is not; and I know I shall have a fair hearing. If I might have my measure as I wish to carry it, I would have property of every description amenable to the sustentation of the people of Ireland. And here I will mention a circumstance which just recurs to my recollection. The last time I came before my townsmen, here, on this subject, an honourable gentleman whom I see opposite, Mr. Baines, said that a poor-law in Ireland would have the effect of absorbing the whole property of the country. If that were true, how very inadequate must the tithes, even the whole of them, be for the required purpose! Who can say that that resource is adequate to the great emergency which opens before you? According to my plan, I would not take from the little cultivator any part of his produce; but see how the system proposed would play into the hands of overseers in that respect. And supposing that the tithes are sufficient, what, then, becomes of the four millions which are annually abstracted by those who are neglecting their duties, and who are many of them the most oppressive landlords on earth? (Applause.) I repeat it; I have said it to the faces of some of them; I have said it before the British public, and I repeat, that some of the most oppressive landlords on earth are to be found in Ireland. Of fourteen or fifteen millions of rental, about four millions go to support those absentees: some of it in the metropolis of England, perchance, some of it in Paris, and some of it in those seats of corruption and vice too commonly to

be found in another favourite country—I mean in Italy. They take from the hard-worked peasant, the pittance he ought to share with them; and yet the political economists of the *Maculloch school* have, in their reviews, magazines, newspapers, and other publications, made it clearly out, that it is no manner of mischief at all if a great wealthy proprietor, owning his forty or sixty thousand acres, should desert his poor tenantry and neighbours, and leave them without labour. ("No," and cheers.) No man living can deny with truth what I say. ("No.") No man living can deny that this is the state of the case; or say that there is any mystification in the argument. Shall I give you the pedigree of some of these estates? I wish not to speak disrespectfully of any political opponents. ("Speak of the Duke of Newcastle first." Mr. JOSHUA BOWER—"No, let's have the Bishops first." "The Bishops first." An interruption occurred for some time, in the midst of which Mr. Samuel Clapham attempted to speak, but the Mayor pronounced Mr. Sadler in possession of the meeting. The hon. Gent. thus proceeded.) Gentlemen, I have nothing whatever to complain of you. You did not interrupt me, nor would you have done so if the gentleman who has taken great pains since to call you to order had not led the way. (Mr. Bower here denied that he was the cause of the uproar, which occasioned another interruption for some time.) Gentlemen, need I again tell you that whether the tithes are in the hands of ecclesiastics or laymen, I am an enemy to the collection of tithes, and of the system of tithes? I said years ago, in a book that is before the public, that it was the relic of a barbarous system, oppressive of course in its operation to all classes. But suppose that the *Duke of Devonshire* may have seventy parishes, and the ecclesiastic only one. (Here Mr. Sadler was interrupted by the persons before-mentioned, who stood behind him.) I must complain of the con-

" duct of those individuals, I am called
 " upon to take part in the discussion of
 " this question, at a moment's warning,
 " without any preparation, and yet I am
 " not allowed to follow my own course,
 " though no part of the subject would I
 " willingly omit. Still, gentlemen, I
 " say, that whether I see a resident ec-
 " clesiastic who may have a single pa-
 " rish, or the *Duke of Devonshire* who
 " may have seventy, I am not to draw
 " the distinction—I think it is a barba-
 " rous system. As his Majesty's Go-
 " vernment have done me the honour,
 " without my privity, to place me on
 " the committee regarding tithes in
 " Ireland, though I am understood to
 " be opposed to them on many politi-
 " cal questions, I say that I will ap-
 " proach the question, as one of that
 " committee, with the most thorough
 " intention of assisting the oppressed
 " people of Ireland. (Applause.) But
 " I will tell you again, that that is not
 " enough for me; and I will make a
 " few observations upon what has fallen
 " from Mr. Lees. I am happy to see
 " that there is a growing intelligence
 " among the people of England; they
 " are not now content to know a part
 " of a subject, but they wish to know
 " the whole of it. (Applause.) I am
 " one of those who have expressed their
 " regret at the infamous *spoliation*
 " which took place in the reign of Henry
 " the Eighth, when so much of the
 " church-property, which I admit ought
 " to have been preserved and better dis-
 " tributed was misappropriated. Mr.
 " Lees has told you that one-third of
 " the property was applied to the relief
 " of the poor: the fact is, that the ratio,
 " as mentioned by the venerable Bede,
 " was one-fourth. I admit that the dif-
 " ference is not very material; because
 " the whole would be insufficient: the
 " poor, indeed, might have been bene-
 " fited, might have been blessed by it,
 " but by an infamous act of spoliation,
 " unexampled in any previous age of
 " the world, and never afterwards imi-
 " tated but on one occasion, to which I
 " will advert, the property of the coun-
 " try was sent away and diverted from
 " its source. It is calculated that, at

" one period, one-third of the property
 " of the country was diverted to reli-
 " gious purposes; that is, for the sup-
 " port of the ecclesiastics and the poor;
 " and an eminent lawyer, the venerable
 " Coke, has said, with regard to the
 " *abbey lands* which were confiscated,
 " that '*the poor have not only a moral*
 " '*but a legal title to relief from them.*'
 " (Applause.) But let us deal fairly;
 " '*fair-play is a jewel;*' and there's
 " not an Englishman, nor an Irishman,
 " but would scorn to do otherwise, I
 " believe. I am not one of those
 " speakers who wish to blink a subject;
 " therefore, I ask you, 'Who is it that
 " have got that immense plunder? Who
 " have it?' This applies not to me: I
 " have not a farthing of it. I never had
 " a farthing's worth of property in
 " church lands, and I never will have.
 " My views are other than to live by
 " such spoliation as this. But who has
 " this property? Who has it? Address
 " this language to his Grace the Duke
 " of Bedford, every farthing of whose
 " property consists of that spoliation.
 " (Applause.) Ask his Grace the Duke
 " of Devonshire. (Applause.) I can go
 " through the whole list, but I do not
 " wish. God forbid that I should se-
 " lect these merely from political con-
 " siderations. I do not. (Laughter,
 " cheers, and 'Go into Northumber-
 " land.') Just as in England so in Ire-
 " land; let me tell you the plain mat-
 " ters of fact. A physician of the name
 " of Petty went to Ireland as a medical
 " attendant; he doctored to some pur-
 " pose, for he obtained at least 40,000
 " acres of confiscated land, which had
 " been torn from the poor of that island,
 " and which is possessed in perpetuity
 " under the name of the Marquis of
 " Lansdowne. This is the point to
 " which I alluded. I am not going to
 " say how we are to deal with them;
 " but I do say that those who have got
 " those large slices of that country, not
 " only taken from the ecclesiastics, but
 " often from the confiscated property of
 " laymen, inasmuch as it is calculated
 " that three-fourths of the surface of
 " that country were wrested from the
 " inhabitants and given to Englishmen!

"ought to contribute their quota towards the sustentation of the destitute. My object is not to take from those on whom it has devolved, the obligation of maintaining the poor. If you touch only the former, the ecclesiastical property, there is not enough for the purpose; but my views extend much beyond the calculations that have been made by those who support the amendment."

MR. BAINES.

"Mr. Baines then went on to reply to parts of Mr. Sadler's speech. There were not only lay absentees from Ireland, he said, there were also ecclesiastical ones; and out of the *two millions of annual revenue enjoyed by the Irish bishops and other dignitaries of the church*, a very large portion of the sum was spent in England and on the continent. As to the question of the original appropriation of the tithes, one-fourth went to the bishop, another fourth to the officiating clergyman, a third-fourth to the maintenance of the edifice of the church, and the remaining fourth to the support of the poor. 'Three parties have enjoyed their rights, but the remaining party, the poor, have been deprived of theirs.' (Cheers.) I make not this assertion upon a light foundation, but on the statement of one of the highest legal authorities in this kingdom, that is, Judge Blackstone. There is a short passage in his *Commentaries*, under the head of 'Rights,' which I will read for your information. The words are these:—'At the first establishment of the parochial clergy, the tithes of the parish were distributed in a four-fold division; one for the use of the bishop, another for maintaining the fabric of the church, a third for the poor, and the fourth to provide for the incumbent. When the sees of the bishops became otherwise amply endowed, they were prohibited from demanding their usual share of these tithes, and the division was into *three parts only*.' I think I have now grounded my opinion on

law. The next observation I have to make is—you see there are three parties amongst whom the tithes should be divided, so that one-third part of them in Ireland would formerly belong to the poor. Let me ask if, for ages past, they *have got that share?* ('No, no.') If all the declamation we have heard on the suffering of Ireland had been directed to its proper point, what ought we to have said in the first instance? We should have said, 'You have *usurped the property* of the poor; they are in great distress; give them back what you have taken from them, and the consequence will be, they will be in a state of comparative comfort.' That is the case with respect to the church-property in Ireland. Mr. Sadler has said this church-property would not be sufficient to maintain the poor. It is very probable you will be of that opinion; but it will go far to maintain them. If you appropriate it, it will have a share in their support, if it does not do it altogether. But Mr. Sadler has declined to enter into calculations; he says that he will not enter into calculations, but I know that, in order to arrive at a just conclusion, it is necessary to do so. I will tell you how the state of things is in Ireland. In the first place, the *church revenue* of that country amounts to no smaller a sum than 3,340,000*l.* per annum. (Shame, shame.) I must observe, too, that the tithes of that amount to near 1,000,000*l.* If the poor had their share, would it be a contemptible portion, think you? (No, no.) When you are told that this amendment will impede the course of benevolence, the reverse of the fact is presented to you. Mr. Baines proceeded in this strain of argument at considerable length. Referring to Mr. Sadler's observations on the *great Whig absentees*, Mr. Baines's political friends, he said it gave him pain to the core to hear such *illiberality*, and he retorted by observing that it was not fair to blame the Duke of Bedford, or the Duke of Devonshire, any more than the Duke of Newcastle (cheers, and hear, hear,

"from the Association-people) or the Duke of Northumberland. (Hear, hear.) The *abbey lands* and *lay tithes* were the *private property* of the Dukes of Bedford and Devonshire and the Marquis of Lansdowne: it had been in their families for *many years*; and, therefore, *that* was as sacred as any other private property."

"*There now*," as the old woman at Portsdown fair exclaimed, when she saw the wonderful intellectual feats of the learned pig; "*there now!* Lard Jesus Christ!" What do you, what can you want *more* than this? What have you to do but to let *us* work our way? I would say to you, in a parody on Pope:

Look here, O'Connell! Leave all meaner matter
To Rice and Parnell's and Proud Stanley's chatter.

And let them, for God's sake, chatter away. Let Proud STANLEY, who made his *debut* in the House of Houses by a speech in defence of the principle, that *tithes were as much private property as any other property was*: let him answer MACAULAY's man, BAINES; and let BROUGHAM AND VAUX, who unequivocally held the same doctrine last spring, answer BAINES, who *really put him into Parliament for Yorkshire*, and who thereby made him a *Lord*. Let VAUX, let wise VAUX, answer Baines. But now, will MACAULAY *abide* by the pledge that Baines has given for him? Will MACAULAY, who has defended the Reform Bill upon the ground that it will make *no change* in the manner of conducting the affairs of the country; will MACAULAY, who scorns the "*crazy radical*," agree that the incomes of the parsons and bishops in Ireland should be in part, at least, taken away from them? If he will not, he dare not show his face in Leeds; and if he will, what will Brougham and Vaux and the *Lord of Calne* say to him! And what will Dukey Bedford and Dukey Devonshire say to him? For as to the *distinction* that BAINES makes between *clerical* and *lay church-property*, he will soon see how it will vanish from even his own head, encumbered as it is by rubbishy lumber. DOCTOR BLACK, in remarking on these speeches, says, that it is evident

that Mr. Sadler wishes to *frighten the great Whig landlords*; but that he *will not succeed!* I am glad to hear you say so, Doctor: very glad: I was afraid they would be scared by these doctrines at Leeds. Oh! Doctor, Doctor! Now what think you of the "*PIG'S MEAT?*" Don't you see that your brother BAINES has been *at the trough*. In short (and all the nation sees it), it is that same "*pig's meat*" that has torn up the corrupt concern, though like the poetic oak, it seemed to have its roots in hell.

There they are in the *mess*: let them get out of it in their own way, if they will not take mine. I could not help laughing to hear Proud STANLEY, when he brought forward the Irish Reform Bill, say that they would make the change, though they might in reason be *restrained from doing it*, in consequence of the *agitation!* The *reporter* gives him the following words, forming part of the opening to his speech. "At the same time he was quite aware he was exposed to no contemptible arguments from those who, admitting the general principle, did yet contend, that neither the time nor the circumstances of Ireland were propitious for such a change. *These persons* asked if it were advisable to extend *popular rights* at a moment when the law was set at defiance—when almost *unbridled license* prevailed, and when excitement the *most formidable* was fomented and did exist? He was aware of the force of this argument. It was an *additional difficulty* thrown in their way, by those who had *promoted combination*, and occasioned *commotion throughout the land* (hear, hear)—by men professing good-will towards the cause of reform, and who had industriously contrived to throw, at every step, the most serious obstacles in the way of reform. (Cheers.) But notwithstanding this *strong reason for abstaining from change*, he said, that if in justice and reason, and not because of, but in spite of *agitation* which prevailed, they considered the measure would be advisable, they should not hesitate nor refuse to act *fairly towards Ireland.*"

When one hears such puling stuff from the lips of a thing called "*the minister for Ireland*," one ceases to wonder at the state of that country! Who does not see that the conceited thing here puts into the mouths of others the thoughts and wishes that are in his own mind and heart? Oh! how he curses the hour that the Reform Bill was first brought in! Oh! how he wishes that little LORD JOHN had been writing "*Don Carloses*," or diplomatic histories, or playing at ball, or with Tonbridge ware, or had been at anything and any-where, rather than in the chapel of Saint Stephen, playing off his bill! Such a fellow as this does not ask himself *what would have taken place* if the bill had not been brought in. Such a fellow looks upon the reform as a thing *given to us*; a pure gift, from him and his brother tax-eaters: a thing which they *might have withheld if they had chosen to do it*! There are no bounds to the workings of a skull so innately insolent in all its thoughts. He even hints, that they *might*, if they *chose*, hold their hands *even now*! That they might, if they would, "*abstain from making the change*," even after all that has passed! Let them *try* it! Let them try it: I, for my part, will not supplicate them to proceed: let them stop if they like: and let them tell us, that the cause is, that *you make speeches against them*!

You do bait and badger them, to be sure; but what do they say to Sadler and Baines; to Baines and the electors of Brougham and Vaux? You have never said anything approaching towards the blow, aimed at the THING by VAUX BROUGHAM's Yorkshire patron. He is for no *agitation*: he is for doing the thing *quietly*. Baines will not touch *impropriations*: oh, no! they are *private property*; forgetting, or, in truth, never having known, that the bishops and deans and chapters are impropriators, and that the *advowsons* themselves are, in most cases, impropriations! Ah! Lord! It is all confusion! The whole thing really seems destined to go to pieces in the hands of these Whigs. When they were planning the ousting of Wellington, I said I thought they would, if they got

in, bring it to an end; and, really, the chattering of this STANLEY, and of MACAULAY the other day, forbids one to hope that a quiet and equitable arrangement is to be expected. They have the power in their hands. It is a parcel of children, playing with wood-coals, amidst barrels of gunpowder. We cannot *take the coals away*: they would squall like so many devils if we were to attempt that: and in the bustle the magazine would certainly blow up. We must, therefore, let them alone, taking care to be, if possible, prepared for the explosion. Pray, Sir, leave them for a little to SADLER and BAINES and the upholders of Vaux Brougham. Let the Irish Reform Bill pass, as you would hear a ballad sung. Be assured that the deliverance of Ireland *is to come from England*; and that hinting threats of *separation* is worse, and a great deal worse, than *nonsense*.

I am your most humble
and obedient servant,
WM. COBBETT.

N.B. The SIX MANCHESTER LECTURES, with a PREFACE, and with a letter to Mr. O'CONNELL subjoined, are just published, in a volume, price 2s. 6d. in boards. The book is to be had at my shop, No. 11, BOLT-COURT, FLEET-STREET, LONDON; of Mr. LEWIS, Manchester; Mr. THOMAS SMITH, Liverpool; Mr. WILCOXSON, Preston; and of all Booksellers in town and in the country.

BRISTOL PETITION.

NOTHING was ever more laudable than the following petition from Bristol. The language, the sentiments, the statement, the prayer; all reflect the highest honour on the heads as well as the hearts of the petitioners. I hope it will have the wished-for effect; and that neither that fine city nor the fine town of Nottingham is destined to be stained with

the bl
has c
they t
ceedin
be ta
my w
shoul
these
In th
punis
is the
ment
ple pr
be co
CLEA
ferers
tigati
calcu
every
merc

"TO
"Th

"

of th
Thro
pres
pers
you
orde
law
lati
city
you
nes
and

the
cu
th
th
gr
sa
th
M
fa
a
li
t
s
i
j

the blood of the men, whom the law has condemned to death for the part they took in the late tumultuous proceedings. I do hope, that *life* is not to be taken upon this occasion; and, if my wish could avail anything no one should, on account of proceedings in these cases, be sent from the country. In these, and in all other cases of punishment, *the effect of the example* is the only thing that a wise government will look at. To make that example produce a *good* effect, all men must be *convinced*, that the punishment is **CLEARLY MERITED** by the sufferers. Here are circumstances of mitigation, most judiciously stated, and calculated to produce great effect in every breast susceptible of feelings of mercy.

"TO THE KING'S MOST EXCELLENT MAJESTY.

"The humble Petition of the undersigned Inhabitants of the City of Bristol.

"Sire—We, the undersigned Inhabitants of the City of Bristol, beg to approach your Throne with the most sincere and ardent expressions of our attachment to your Majesty's person and government. We yield to none of your Majesty's subjects in our love of social order, in our desire to uphold and obey the laws, and in detestation of the criminal violation of them which lately disgraced our city; and we are at all times ready to support your Majesty's Government in any measures necessary to prevent the recurrence of tumult and crime.

"It is with grief and horror we reflect on the loss of human life which has already occurred in this city; and we are animated by the strongest feelings of detestation against the perpetrators of those tumultuous and disgraceful proceedings. So appalling was the sacrifice of life on that melancholy occasion, that we are most anxious to submit to your Majesty's serious consideration any mitigatory facts in the cases of those convicted which may afford the slightest chance of saving their lives; and we beg further to call your attention to the *remarkable absence of those circumstances of aggravation* by which the carrying into effect the extreme penalty of the law is justified.

"We beg leave to point out to your Majesty's notice the entire absence of any testimony *showing a guilty premeditation*; that it has been made evident that the excesses of the mob arose from *the impulse of the moment* and that, amid the excitement and the devastation of property, they restrained themselves from outrages *affecting personal safety*.

"We beg also to call your Majesty's most gracious consideration to another important fact. The guilty conduct of most of the criminals capitally convicted began *at a late period of the riots*, when the unrestricted access to intoxicating liquors, which accidentally and unfortunately fell in their way, and the impunity that attended the first outrages, involved them in a depth of crime, which, in all probability, would have been prevented, had the proper measures been taken to check their mad and criminal career, and to restore the peace of the city.

"We are fully sensible of the enormous guilt of the prisoners; but we earnestly implore your Majesty to exercise your royal clemency, by sparing the lives of these unhappy men, and, by commuting their punishment, thus afford them an opportunity of repenting of the injuries they have inflicted on society.

"And your petitioners, as in duty bound, will ever pray."

COBBETT'S HISTORY OF THE REGENCY AND REIGN OF GEO. IV.

I HAVE published *nine Numbers* of this work. I shall publish no more of it *in Numbers*. I find this an inconvenient way for me in the case of a work like this. There are so many books that I am obliged to refer to, that to write the work *by spells* is extremely inconvenient. The tables of my room are spread over with books; and then they are all laid aside again, and I mislay papers and do not easily find them again. For this reason, and because I want the work out, to be ready, with all its documents and other matter, for the times that are at hand, I shall, as soon as I get to London (from the *Isle of Wight*), set to work, and finish the book "*right away*," as the Yankees call it.—Those

gentlemen who have taken the nine numbers will have the *remaining part only to pay for*; because that part will be printed expressly for *their accommodation*.

No. VII.

HISTORY OF THE REGENCY AND REIGN OF GEO. IV.

BY WILLIAM COBBETT.

(Continued from No. 4, col. 252. Vol. 74.)

144. The act of the Americans, which act we have just seen, and which was passed in May 1812, was, as was evident to all but the stupid and arrogant men who ruled England, a mere preamble to a declaration of war; and, accordingly, this declaration very speedily followed it. In America so important an affair as that of making war is not left to the decision of the executive magistrate and his ministers. It is not left to those who have commissions in the army and the navy to bestow; it is not left to those whose relations and dependents may fatten upon contracts arising out of the war: it is a power the exercise of which is retained by the people themselves; and the act is performed by the whole body of the representatives of the people. War is in short enacted in the same manner as any other thing is enacted; and this war was enacted by the Congress in the following act:

“Act of Congress, declaring war against
“England.

“An Act, declaring war between the United
“Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland,
“and the Dependencies thereof, and the
“United States of America, and their Terri-
“tories.

“Be it enacted, by the senate and house of
“representatives of the United States of
“America, in congress assembled, That war
“be and the same is hereby declared to exist
“between the United Kingdom of Great
“Britain and Ireland, and the Dependencies
“thereof, and the United States of America,
“and their territories; and that the President
“of the United States be and he is hereby
“authorised to use the whole land and naval
“forces of the United States to carry the same
“into effect; and to issue to private armed
“vessels of the United States, commissions or
“letters of marque and general reprisal, in
“such form as he shall think proper and under
“the seal of the United States, against the
“vessels, goods, and effects of the government
“of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and
“Ireland, and the subjects thereof.

“June 18, 1812.—Approved,

“JAMES MADISON.

“Washington, July 18, 4 o'clock p. m.”

145. It was in this simple, plain, sensible, and honest manner, that the United States declared this war. Here are none of those false professions and pretences that other governments resort to. It is the declaration of a free people, and it is made in words becoming such a people. The English ministry did not answer this declaration at all. They could not answer it; but issued a miserable order in council for the seizure and detention of American vessels; and not for the condemnation of them; not for making prize of them; and not for committing hostilities against the United States in any manner whatever. All the documents relating to the *grounds* of this most important war ought to be preserved; and even the small space which is alone compatible with my plan demands the insertion of this order in council, which was the only answer ever given to the plain and honest declaration on the part of America.

“At the Court at Carlton House, the 31st
“of July, 1812, present his Royal Highness
“the Prince Regent in Council;—It is this
“day ordered, by his Royal Highness the
“Prince Regent, in the name and on the be-
“half of his Majesty, and by and with the ad-
“vice of His Majesty's Privy Council, that
“no ship or vessel belonging to any of his
“Majesty's subjects, be permitted to enter
“and clear out for any of the ports within the
“territories of the United States of America,
“until further order; and his Royal Highness
“is further pleased, in the name and on be-
“half of his Majesty, and by and with the
“advice aforesaid, to order, that a general
“embargo or stop be made of all ships and
“vessels whatsoever, belonging to the citizens
“of the United States of America, now within,
“or which shall hereafter come into, any of
“the ports, harbours, and roads, within any
“part of his Majesty's dominions, together
“with all persons and effects on board all
“such ships or vessels; and that the com-
“manders of his Majesty's ships of war and
“privateers do detain and bring into port all
“ships and vessels belonging to the citizens
“of the United States of America, or bearing
“the flag of the said United States, except
“such as may be furnished with British
“licenses, which vessels are allowed to pro-
“ceed according to the tenor of the said li-
“censes; but that the utmost care be taken
“for the preservation of all and every part of
“the cargoes on board any of the said ships or
“vessels, so that no damage or embezzlement
“whatever be sustained; and the Commanders
“of his Majesty's ships of war and privateers
“are hereby instructed to detain and bring
“into port every such ship and vessel accord-
“ingly, except such as are above excepted:
“and the Right Hon. the Lords Commissioners
“of his Majesty's Treasury, the Lords Com-
“missioners of the Admiralty, and Lord War-
“den of the Cinque Ports, are to give the
“necessary directions herein as to them may
“respectively appertain.

“CHETWYND.”

146. This order in council was intended for the insolent purpose of making the world believe that it was beneath the *English* government to declare war against such a country as America, and at the same time for the base purpose of seducing the commercial part of the United States from their due obedience to the government of their country; to effect which latter purpose, as we shall see farther on in this history, the foulest means had, for a long while, been employed. Both these purposes were completely defeated in the end, as will hereafter be shown by the events of 1814 and 1815, until we come to the history of which years we must lay aside the subject of this second war against America; not, however, without adverting to the memorable words of the president MADISON, in that message to the congress, which the congress immediately answered by the above declaration of war. "Our moderation and consideration (said he in his message of the 1st June 1812) have had no other effect than to encourage perseverance in wrong-doing. We behold our seafaring citizens still the daily victims of lawless violence committed on the great and common highway of nations, even within sight of the country which owes them protection. We behold our vessels, freighted with the products of our soil and industry, or returning with the honest proceeds of them, wrested from their lawful destination, confiscated by prize courts no longer the organs of public law, but the instruments of arbitrary edicts; and their unfortunate crews dispersed and lost, or forced or inveigled in British ports into British fleets; whilst arguments are employed in support of these aggressions, which have no foundation but in a principle equally supporting a claim to regulate our external commerce in all cases whatsoever.—We behold, in fine, on the side of Great Britain, a state of war against the United States; and on the side of the United States; a state of peace towards Great Britain.—Whether the United States shall continue passive under these progressive usurpations, and these accumulating wrongs; or, opposing force to force, in defence of their natural rights, shall commit a just cause into the hands of the Almighty Disposer of events; avoiding all connexions which might entangle it in the contests or views of other powers, and preserving a constant readiness to concur in an honourable re-establishment of peace and friendship, is a solemn question, which the constitution wisely confides to the legislative department of the government. In recommending it to their early deliberations, I am happy in the assurance that the decision will be worthy of the enlightened and patriotic councils of a virtuous, a free and a powerful nation."

147. It was pretended by the English ministers and noised about by their hireling press, that the Americans favoured France in the war which she was carrying on against England, or

rather that England was carrying on against her; and even the members of parliament were in the habit of representing, by their speeches, Mr. MADISON as a mere tool in the hands of NAPOLEON. Nothing was ever more false than this: one single instance of this partiality was never produced. France also had committed aggressions against the Americans; but she had never committed that great aggression of all, namely, the impressing and flogging of native American citizens. The truth is, that both nations, England and France, wished to force America into the war, each of them on its own side; and the Americans resolved to take part with neither. There was a faction in America, on each side also; but the nation and the government were for strict and honest neutrality; for cheap government, and for getting out of debt. The English faction in America was by far the most powerful, and, in the sequel we shall see what base means were made use of for the purpose of raising up an opposition to the government; but, those means recoiled at least upon the heads of the men that had employed them.

148. With regard to public opinion in England relative to this important war, the war may be said to have been popular; because the myriads who fattened upon war, were all for war; and because the press was in such a state, was so shackled on the one hand, and so completely mercenary on the other hand, that it was impossible for the people to come at any-thing like the truth upon the subject; any man who should have dared to make a statement in print relative to the treatment of impressed American citizens; any man who should have dared truly to describe the flogging and other brutal usage of those innocent persons, would have been prosecuted by the attorney-general, would have been ruined, and half put to death. So that the state of things was much worse than if there had been no press at all; and, besides this, the prayers of taxes were so cowed down, they had been brought by degrees to so complete a state of slavery; the national mind was become so abject; that even an event like this war, fraught as it manifestly was with a monstrous addition to the debt, and with disgrace such as England never before experienced; even an event like this seemed to attract far less attention than a gala day for the showing off of splendour purchased with the sweat of the people.

149. This war was a legacy, left by PERCEVAL to his successors, and the expense of it a legacy left to the oppressed people of England. That oppressed people most sincerely rejoiced that he was no more; and at Nottingham, Leicester, Sheffield, Wakefield, Chester, Birmingham, Carlisle, and many other places, they openly expressed their satisfaction by every demonstration of joy. Those who lived on the taxes, on the other hand, expressed their sorrow: both the political factious, feeling it to be a common cause, mourned at the

event, and well would it have been for the people if they had contented themselves with mourning. But, besides mourning, they fell to work with wonderful unanimity, and as if with a desire to punish the people for their joy, by inflicting on them the effects of enormous pensions to the widow and the eldest son of the deceased minister, besides voting them fifty thousand pounds down in ready money. The two pensions, if calculated on the usual duration of life, could not be reckoned at a less sum than another sixty or eighty thousand pounds; and these grants were made out of the taxes raised upon the people at a time when distress was so pinching, when hunger was so sharp, as to drive thousands upon thousands of English men and women to brave all the dangers of the terrible penal code; they were made at a time when the industrious people in the north were so pressed with hunger as to venture their lives for the sake of a handful of potatoes, and when a woman was actually hanged at Manchester, upon a charge of highway robbery, she having snatched some potatoes from a cart to carry home to her naked and starving children.

(To be continued.)

From the *LONDON GAZETTE*,

FRIDAY, JANUARY 20, 1832.

INSOLVENT.

HILL, I., Strand, hatter.

BANKRUPTCY SUPERSEDED.

SCRIVENER, H. N., Palmer's-folly, Ratcliff-highway, builder.

BANKRUPTS.

BAINES, D., St. Martin's-lane, victualler.
 BENSON, G., Kensington, plumber.
 DAWSON, W., Waltham, Lincolnsh., tanner.
 EVANS, G., Mold, Flintshire, cattle-dealer.
 FARDEN, S., Gutter-lane, dealer.
 FARRAR, W., Bread-street, Cheapside, ware-houseman.
 POWELL, S., Blackman-street, Southwark, draper.
 RAPER, T., Fleet-street, tailor.
 SAWYER, J., and G. Lowley, Sheffield, table-knife-manufacturers.
 SHALLCROSS, T., Liverpool, prov.-dealer.
 SMITH, H., Fleet-lane, victualler.
 TRANFIELD, T., Marylebone-lane, victualler.
 VOAKES, W., Pocklington, Yorkshire, draper.

SCOTCH SEQUESTRATION.

GRANT, N., solicitor.

TUESDAY, JANUARY 25, 1832.

INSOLVENTS.

FORSAITH, S. S., Whitechapel-road, haberdasher.
 GASCOYNE, R., Richmond, Surrey, tailor.
 LINDSAY, J. S., Great Cambridge-street, Hackney-road, merchant.
 PURSGLOVE, J., Hurstmonceux, Sussex, common-brewer.

BANKRUPTS.

BLACKBAND, E. G., Macclesfield, grocer.
 BOSTOCK, G., Old Cavendish-street, tailor.
 BUCKLEY, J., Liverpool, cheese-factor.
 CASTSE, G. jun., Commercial-repairing-dock, Rotherhithe, ship-builder.
 COVERDALE, P. J., Barking, Essex, surgeon.
 CROSTON, W. jun., Toxteth-park, Liverpool, painter.
 GADESBY, Hopwas, Staffordshire, victualler.
 GERVES, T., Hendon, Middlesex, hay-salesman.
 HUGHES, E., E. Hughes, and H. Hughes, Manchester, cotton-spinners.
 JOHNSON, W., Manchester, innkeeper.
 LAW, J., Lloyd, Staffordshire, farmer.
 PYNE, C., Earl's-court, Old Brompton, dyer.
 SWIFT, J., Liverpool, victualler.
 TANNER, E., Ramsgate, tavern-keeper.
 TAYLOR, T., Rose-st., Newgate-st., meat-salesman.
 UNDERWOOD, T., Bristol, skin-dresser.
 WATSON, J., Wood-street, Cheapside, ribband-manufacturer.

SCOTCH SEQUESTRATION.

JAMIESON, W., Castle Lawrie-mills, Stirlingshire, miller.

LONDON MARKETS.

MARK-LANE, CORN-EXCHANGE, JANUARY 23.—Our supplies since this day se'nnight have been rather limited as respects the following articles:—English, Scotch, and foreign wheat; English and Scotch oats; English, Scotch, and foreign peas; foreign beans; Irish and foreign barley; and seeds from all quarters. Of English barley, malt, and beans, and English, Scotch, and foreign flour, the supplies have been moderately good.

In the market of this day, there was an early and rather numerous assemblage of both London and country buyers, the latter of whom were looking out chiefly for seed oats, peas, beans, and malting barley.—As, however, the sellers continued to be stiff to pretty generally advanced prices, the trade was for some time after its commencement rather dull, though subsequently tolerably brisk.

Very fine wheat, and malting, as well as the best sort of grinding barley, oats, and beans, were at an advance of from 1s. to 2s. per qr. The generality of wheat, peas of each kind, malt, flour, good rye, and inferior barley, were at last Monday's quotations.

Clover, and most other grass seeds for Lent or spring sowing, were in increased demand, but not at an advance upon last week's prices.

Wheat	53s. to 70s.
Rye	34s. to 38s.
Barley	26s. to 33s.
— fine	37s. to 42s.
Peas, White	34s. to 38s.
— Boilers	36s. to 40s.
— Grey	34s. to 38s.
Beans, Old	36s. to 42s.
— Tick	34s. to 38s.
Oats, Potatoo	25s. to 30s.
— Poland	24s. to 28s.
— Feed	18s. to 24s.
Flour, per sack	55s. to 60s.

PROVISIONS.

Bacon, Middles, new, 44s. to 46s. per cwt.	
— Sides, new ... 44s. to 46s.	
Pork, India, new .. 125s. 0d. to 128s.	
Pork, Mess, new ... 67s. 0d. to —s. per barl.	
Butter, Belfast 92s. to —s. per cwt.	
— Carlow 89s. to 92s.	
— Cork 91s. to —s.	
— Limerick .. 88s. to 90s.	
— Waterford.. 87s. to 88s.	
— Dublin 85s. to 87s.	
Cheese, Cheshire.... 52s. to 63s.	
— Gloucester, Double.. 52s. to 62s.	
— Gloucester, Single.. 48s. to 54s.	
— Edam 47s. to 50s.	
— Gouda 46s. to 50s.	
Hams, Irish..... 62s. to 70s.	

SMITHFIELD.—January 23.

This day's supply of sheep and beasts was rather numerous, but especially the former, in great part of middling and inferior quality: of fat calves and porkers but limited. The trade was throughout very dull; with the prime beef and veal, generally, at an advance; mutton and pork at a depression of about 2d. per stone; with middling and inferior beef at barely Friday's quotations.

Beasts, 2,590; sheep and lambs, 19,940; calves, 240; pigs, 130.

MARK-LANE.—Friday, Jan. 27.

The arrivals this week are large, but principally of inferior quality. The best samples maintain the prices of Monday, all other sorts are 1s. to 2s. cheaper.

THE FUNDS.

3 per Cent. } Fri. Sat. Mon. Tues. Wed. Thur.	
Cons. Ann. } 82½ 82½ 82½ 82½ 82½ 82½	

COBBETT-LIBRARY.

New Edition.

COBBETT'S Spelling-Book;

(Price 2s.)

Containing, besides all the usual matter of such a book, a clear and concise

INTRODUCTION TO ENGLISH GRAMMAR.

This I have written by way of

A Stepping-Stone to my own Grammar;

Such a thing having been frequently suggested to me by Teachers as necessary.

1. ENGLISH GRAMMAR.—Of this work sixty thousand copies have now been published. This is a duodecimo volume, and the price is 3s. bound in boards.

2. An ITALIAN GRAMMAR, by Mr. JAMES PAUL COBBETT.—Being a Plain and Compendious Introduction to the Study of Italian. Price 6s.

3. COTTAGE ECONOMY.—I wrote this Work professedly for the use of the labouring and middling classes of the English nation. I made myself acquainted with the best and simplest modes of making beer and bread, and these I made it as plain as, I believe, words could make it. Also of the keeping of Cows, Pigs, Bees, and Poultry, matters which I understood as well as any body could, and in all their details. It includes my writings also on the Straw Plait. A Duodecimo Volume. Price 2s. 6d.

4. YEAR'S RESIDENCE IN AMERICA.—The Price of this book, in good print and on fine paper, is 5s.

5. The ENGLISH GARDENER; or, a Treatise on the situation, soil, enclosing and laying out, of Kitchen Gardens; on the making and managing of Hot-beds and Green-houses; and on the propagation and cultivation of all sorts of Kitchen Garden Plants, and of Fruit Trees, whether of the Garden or the Orchard. And also, on the formation of Shrubberies and Flower Gardens. Price 6s.

6. THE WOODLANDS; or, a Treatise on the preparing of the ground for planting; on the planting, on the cultivating, on the pruning, and on the cutting down, of Forest Trees and Underwoods. Price 14s. bound in boards.

7. PAPER AGAINST GOLD; or, the History and Mystery of the National Debt, the Bank of England, the Funds, and all the Trickery of Paper Money. The Price of this book, very nicely printed, is 5s.

9. TULL'S HORSE-HOEING HUSBANDRY; or, a Treatise on the Principles of Tillage and Vegetation. With an Introduction, by WM. COBBETT. 8vo. Price 15s.

19. PROTESTANT "REFORMATION" in England and Ireland, showing how that event has impoverished and degraded the main body of the people in those countries. Two volumes, bound in boards. The Price of the first volume is 4s. 6d. The Price of the second volume 3s. 6d.

8. SERMONS.—There are twelve of these, in one volume, on the following subjects: 1. Hypocrisy and Cruelty; 2. Drunkenness; 3. Bribery; 4. Oppression; 5. Unjust Judges; 6. The Sluggard; 7. The Murderer; 8. The Gamester; 9. Public Robbery; 10. The Unnatural Mother; 11. The Sin of Forbidding Marriage; 12. On the Duties of Parsons, and on the Institution and Object of Tithes. Price 3s. 6d. bound in boards.

A Thirteenth Sermon, entitled "GOOD FRIDAY; or, The Murder of Jesus Christ by the Jews." Price 6d.

10. POOR MAN'S FRIEND. A new edition. Price 8d.

11. THE LAW OF TURNPIKES. By William Cobbett, Jun., Student of Lincoln's Inn. Price 3s. 6d. boards.

12. FRENCH GRAMMAR; or, Plain Instructions for the Learning of French. Price bound in boards, 5s.

13. THE EMIGRANT'S GUIDE. Just now Published, under this Title, a little Volume, containing Ten Letters, addressed to English Tax-payers. A new edition, with a Postscript, containing an account of the Prices of Houses and Land, recently obtained from America by Mr. Cobbett. Price 2s. 6d. in bds.

14. MR. JAMES PAUL COBBETT'S RIDE OF EIGHT HUNDRED MILES IN FRANCE. Second Edition, Price 2s. 6d.

15. ROMAN HISTORY, French and English, intended, not only as a History for Young People to read, but as a Book of Exercises to accompany my French Grammar. Two Volumes. Price 13s. in boards.

16. MARTENS'S LAW OF NATIONS.—This is the Book which was the foundation of all the knowledge that I have ever possessed relative to public law. The Price is 17s., and the manner of its execution is, I think, such as to make it fit for the Library of any Gentleman.

17. LETTERS FROM FRANCE: containing Observations made in that Country during a Residence of Two Months in the South, and Three Months at Paris. By JOHN M. COBBETT. Price 4s. in boards.

18. A TREATISE ON COBBETT'S CORN; containing Instructions for Propagating and Cultivating the Plant, and for Harvesting and Preserving the Crop; and also an account of the several uses to which the Produce is applied. Price 2s. 6d.

In the Press.

A GEOGRAPHICAL DICTIONARY OF ENGLAND AND WALES.—This Work, which has been so long in hand, is now in the *Press*. It will contain the Name, Situation, &c., of every *Parish*, and even of every *Hamlet*; it will contain a description, and an Account of the *Country*; also of each *County*; and will, I trust, convey *more useful information on this subject*, than has ever been conveyed in all other books put together. It is not a book made to flatter fools, nor to hide the doings of public robbers: it is to convey a mass of important truths; its object is to make the English reader *well acquainted* with all that he need know about his own country. The precise *bulk* and *price* of the Book I cannot yet state; but I imagine that it will be a Thick Duodecimo Volume (six or seven hundred pages), and that the Price will be from Eleven to Thirteen Shillings.

THE PORTRAIT

Is now ready for sale. Those gentlemen who sent their names some time ago, shall have the Portrait sent to them directly.—The proof prints are 15s.; the other, 10s.

Lately published, Price 4s. 6d., extra boards,

JOURNAL
OF
A TOUR IN ITALY,
AND ALSO IN PART OF
FRANCE AND SWITZERLAND;

The route being

From Paris, through Lyons, to Marseilles,
and, thence, to Nice, Genoa, Pisa, Florence,
Rome, Naples, and Mount Vesuvius;

AND

By Rome, Terni, Perugia, Arezzo, Florence,
Bologna, Ferrara, Padua, Venice, Verona,
Milan, over the Alps by Mount St. Bern-
nard, Geneva, and the Jura, back into
France;

The space of time being,

From October 1828, to September 1829.

CONTAINING

A description of the country, of the principal
cities and their most striking curiosities;
of the climate, soil, agriculture, horticult-
ure, and products; of the prices of provi-
sions and labour; and of the dresses and
conditions of the people;

AND ALSO

An account of the laws and customs, civil
and religious, and of the morals and de-
meanour of the inhabitants, in the several
States.

By **JAMES P. COBBETT.**

To be had at No. 11, Bolt-court, Fleet-street.

Price One Shilling, to be continued Monthly,
THE CHURCH REFORMERS' MAGA-
ZINE for ENGLAND and IRELAND.
No. I. will be published on Wednesday next,
February 1.

Effingham Wilson, 88, Royal Exchange;
and W. F. Wakeman, 9, D'Olier-street,
Dublin.

* Persons in the country are requested to
transmit their Orders and Advertisements to
the Publisher through their country Book-
sellers.

CHOLERA MORBUS, &c.—To those who
value their health, and seek relief from
pain, &c.—The annexed Affidavit of the 13th
of October, 1831, referred to in a letter ad-
dressed to the Central Board of Health,
Whitehall, as stated in *The Times* of the 14th
inst., is respectfully submitted to the public,
by Mr. STROMBOM, who has the honour of an-
nouncing that he has compounded an Embro-
cation called NE PLUS ULTRA, for the re-
lief of various disorders, particularly Cholera
Morbus, or Bowel Complaints, Lumbago,
Rheumatism, Gout, Contusions, Sprains,
Bruises, Inflammation of the Chest or Lungs,
Tooth-Ache, Sore Throats, Swelled Faces, Tic
Douloureux, Erysipelas, Paralytic and Glandu-
lar Affections, Swelled Ancles, Chills, Corns,
&c., for which he has obtained his Ma-
jesty's Royal Letters Patent, and is now for
sale at his Laboratory, 17, HATTON-
GARDEN, at the rate of 2s. 9d., 4s. 6d., and
10s. 6d. per bottle. Also Mr. STROMBOM's
address to Earl Bathurst, 1825, about the
Cape Currency, &c., and to the Marquis of
Wellesley, about the Commercial and Finan-
cial State of Great Britain, and its Currency,
in 1831, 8vo., sewed, at 2s. 6d., and 4s. in
boards.

Mr. STROMBOM'S Affidavit, respecting
his New Patent Medicine, the NE PLUS
ULTRA AND INCOMPARABLE EM-
BROCATION.—ISAAC STROMBOM, of No. 65,
OLD BROAD STREET, in the City of London,
Merchant, maketh oath, and saith—That the
deponent (after having visited all the four
quarters of the globe, and for about thirty
years resided principally in hot and more or
less enervating climates, and consequently,
through accidental occurrences, having been
subject to severe illnesses, and often so situa-
ted, as well as his family and a large establish-
ment of servants, as to be without any good
medical assistance near at hand to have re-
course to) has been induced to attend a great
deal to the effects of different medicines, and,
particularly of late years, having studied some
of the best medical and surgical authors, in
regard to several complaints which either
himself or any of his family or friends were
subject to:—That, after a great many experi-
ments, by adding such proportions of several
ingredients as might ameliorate the sharpness
and remove the evil of some, without de-
tracting from their good qualities, he has at
last formed a composition of several medi-
cal ingredients, which the deponent firmly
believes, by neutralizing, or absorbing, or
removing the crudities and bad humours,
under and in the proximity of the skin, as
well as for its efficacy (if not in many in-
stances almost instantaneous though gentle
effects, if equalled, not surpassed by any
hitherto known compound) is, for its stimu-
lating, anodyne, and many other beneficial
qualities, both by neutralizing or easing, sub-
duing and removing, several external as well
as internal complaints, by the external appli-
cation of the said composition, which, in every

instance hitherto tried, has been found highly successful; among these are in particular severe bowel complaints, or what is hitherto termed the English Cholera Morbus, spasms in the stomach, cramp, head and face ache, gout, rheumatism, chilblains, contusions, and sprains, pains in the side from disease of the liver, and internal abscesses, besides many other inflammatory complaints and eruptions, &c.—Further, the Deponent verily believes that the said composition, by absorbing or neutralising bad humours, acts greatly as a preventive to many serious illnesses:—And the Deponent saith, that as he verily believes that the circulation and extensive use of his said composition would be greatly beneficial to the public and mankind in general, as well as to his own advantage, he intends to introduce it by a patent, under the name or appellation of

STROMBOM'S NE PLUS ULTRA, AND INCOMPARABLE EMBROCATION.

And the Deponent further saith, that the said Embrocation while consisting of the most efficient ingredients, all of which have been occasionally given individually by the medical profession internally, and from its not containing any mercury, the Deponent verily believes that it is less liable to produce any pernicious effects through its application, than most if not any other hitherto-known compound.

J. STROMBOM.

Sworn before me at the Mansion-house,
London, Oct. 13, 1831.

J. KEY, Mayor.

CHEAP CLOTHING!!

SWAIN AND CO., Tailors, &c.,
93, FLEET-STREET,

(Near the new opening to St. Bride's Church,)

REQUEST the attention of the public to the following list of prices (*for cash only*) which they charge for:—

Gentlemen's Dress Coats of Medley	l. s. d.
Colours.....	2 12 0
Ditto, ditto, Best Saxony Cloth....	3 0 0
Saxony Kerseymere Trousers.....	1 8 0
Ditto ditto Waistcoats.....	12 0
Figured Silk ditto.....	18 0
Venetian Leather Shooting Jackets..	1 10 0
Barogau ditto.....	1 8 0
A Plain Suit of Livery.....	4 4 0

Ladies' Habits and Pelisses, and every description of Clothing for young gentlemen equally cheap. The whole made from good, of the finest quality, and the CUT and WORKMANSHIP not to be surpassed.

I recommend Messrs. Swain and Co. as very good and punctual tradesmen, whom I have long employed with great satisfaction.

WM. COBBETT.

THE "AMERICAN STOVES" from Mr. COBBETT's Model are now ready packed in Baskets, so that no delay in the execution of orders will take place: also, the "LONGITUDINAL CORN-SHELLER" from Mr. COBBETT's Model, price 3*l.* 10*s.*

Just published, price Sixpence,

CONSIDERATIONS touching the likeliest means TO REMOVE HIRELINGS OUT OF THE CHURCH. Wherein is also discoursed of, Tithes, Church Fees, and Church Revenues; and whether any Maintenance of Ministers can be settled by Law.

By **JOHN MILTON,**

Author of "Paradise Lost."

Pontefract: Printed and sold by Charles Elcock; sold also by Longman and Co., London; Baines and Co., Leeds; Noble, Hull; Alexander, York; Lewis, Manchester; Hodgson, Liverpool; Alexander, Yarmouth; Davy and Musket, Bristol; and all other booksellers.

Although more than a century and a half has elapsed since it was written, it applies with great force to the present times; and, indeed, shows that its author "wrote for all ages and for all mankind." The cogent reasoning, the pointed and striking truth of the remarks, the cutting irony, and the earnest seriousness and even solemnity of the style, all bear the impress of genius sanctified to high and holy service; and in reading these pages, we seem to be communing with the spirit of a departed saint on a subject deeply concerning the welfare of the Church of Christ.

MILTON's "CONSIDERATIONS" and EAGLE's "ARGUMENT" concerning Tithes, (published by Saunders and Benning, price Sixpence,) will afford to the attentive reader a complete view of the whole question, in reference both to the LAW of GOD and the LAW of MAN.

Printed by William Cobbett, Johnson's-court; and published by him, at 11, Bolt-court, Fleet-street.